

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PARROTT, T. M.—Mak and Archie Armstrong,	297
WALCUTT, C. C.—The Fire Symbolism in 'Moby Dick,'	304
WEATHERLY, E. H.—Beau Tibbs and Colonel Sellers,	310
GIBBENS, V. E.—A Note on Three Lyrics of Philip Fréneau,	313
DEEN, F. H.—The Genesis of 'Martin Faber' in 'Caleb Williams,'	315
MANNING, C. A.—The Double of Dostoyevsky,	317
KURRELMMEYER, W.—Einzel = einzal,	321
KRAPPE, A. H.—The Historical Background of Philippe de Thaün's 'Bestaire,'	325
PEARCE, JOSEPHINE A.—An Early Talbot Epitaph,	327
HAVENS, R. D.—Parnell's "Hymn to Contentment,"	329
THOMPSON, D. W.—Keats's "To the Nile,"	331
SEELY, F. F.—A Footnote to 'The Road to Xanadu,'	333
AUBIN, R. A.—'Tourist,'	334
GLASHEEN, F. J.—An Early Quotation from Shelley,	335
ATKINS, STUART.—The American Language,	335

REVIEWS:—

C. G. OSGOOD, H. G. LOTSPEICH, D. E. MASON (eds.), <i>The Works of Edmund Spenser. The Minor Poems, Vol. I.</i> [J. W. Bennett.]	336
SIR ISRAEL GOLLANCZ, MAHEL DAY, M. S. SERJEANTSON (eds.), <i>Sir Gawain and the Green Knight.</i> [Henry Savage.]	342
GEORGE SAMPSON, <i>The Concise Cambridge History of English Literature.</i> [Robert Shafer.]	350
E. N. HOOKER (ed.), <i>The Critical Works of John Dennis.</i> [L. I. Bredvold.]	354
L. B. WRIGHT, <i>Religion and Empire, 1558-1625.</i> [H. W. Sams.]	356
ADRIEN BONJOUR, <i>Coleridge's 'Hymn before Sunrise.'</i> [A. H. Nethercot.]	358
LEON HOWARD, <i>The Connecticut Wits.</i> [L. M. Miner.]	359
EMMA DETTI, <i>Margaret Fuller Ossoli e i suoi corrispondenti.</i> [A. Lipari and S. T. Williams.]	361
W. D. PADEN, <i>Tennyson in Egypt.</i> [F. D. Cooley.]	362
L. HARTLEY, <i>This is Lorence, a Narrative of the Reverend Laurence Sterne.</i> [W. B. C. Watkins.]	363
G. H. GEROULD, <i>The Patterns of English and American Fiction.</i> [Ernest Bernbaum.]	364
BRIEF MENTION: G. P. JACKSON (ed.), <i>Down-East Spirituals</i> ; E. J. SIMMONS, <i>An Outline of Modern Russian Literature (1880-1940)</i> ; SISTER MARY J. SCHROEDER, <i>Mary-Verse in Meistergesang</i> ,	365
CORRESPONDENCE: Grete's Bad Name Again,	368

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

KEMP MALONE

HAZELTON SPENCER

C. S. SINGLETON

CHARLES R. ANDERSON

DON CAMERON ALLEN

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, E. Malakis, R. B. Roulston, Pedro Salinas, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00 for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEC.P.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RR.*, *SP.*, *RHS.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

"We're scrimping on paper for Jim!"

CORPORAL JIM's family knows that the food he eats, the ammunition he uses, the blood plasma and medical supplies which may save his life come to him in perfect condition because they are protected by paper and paperboard. That's why they take every possible means of USING LESS PAPER. From Jim's mother who helps the local storekeepers save paper by carrying her own market basket and never requesting useless wrapping for her purchases, to Jim's kid brother who borrows and lends books, papers, and magazines with all his friends — the whole family is joining with all the other patriotic Americans from coast to coast who have vowed



to save a million pounds of paper for the war effort!

This advertisement, contributed to the war effort by this magazine, was prepared by the War Advertising Council in cooperation with the War Production Board and the Office of War Information.



All the magazines in America, added together, USE only 8% of the nation's paper supply. Yet, out of this comparatively small amount, they are SAVING 450 million pounds this year and RELEASING it for vital needs.

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

ser

ors
the
ript
cles
the
of
uo-
not
P.
ors
ness

Modern Language Notes

Volume LIX

MAY, 1944

Number 5

MAK AND ARCHIE ARMSTRANG

Almost half a century ago a German scholar, Professor Eugen Kölbing of Breslau, pointed out the hitherto unnoticed, and highly interesting parallels between the well-known "Mak" episode in the *Secunda Pastorum* of the Towneley Cycle and a modern ballad, *Archie Armstrong's Aith*, in *The Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border* (*Zeitschrift für vergleichende Litteraturgeschichte*, Neue Folge, *Elfter Band*, 1897). He noted briefly, but correctly, that the main difference between the two lay in the conclusion, since in the play the thief is caught and punished, while in the ballad he outwits the shepherds and accomplishes an apparently impossible vow. The question which of these conclusions preserved the original form of the tale Dr. Kölbing held to be unanswerable with any degree of certainty. It is part of the purpose of this note to show that there is good reason for believing that an answer can be given.

Dr. Kölbing further remarked with perfect justice that it was most unlikely that the Reverend John Marriott, the author of the ballad, had acquired his knowledge of the story which he versified from the at that time unprinted Towneley Cycle, first published by the Surtees Society, 1836, i. e. eleven years after Marriott's death, and suggested that the original of both play and poem was an old tradition handed down orally, possibly in verse form. This suggestion may be regarded as a practical certainty, but Dr. Kölbing did not proceed to draw, as he might have done, an interesting consequence therefrom.

The article was promptly "englisht"—the spelling is Furnivall's—in an incomplete and emended form, and appended to Pollard's introduction to a new edition of the *Towneley Plays* (Early English Text Society, 1897). Dr. Furnivall, who collaborated with Pollard in this edition, inserted in the "englishing" a phrase which sug-

gested that *if* the author of the ballad had actually borrowed the story from the Towneley play the whole of his [Marriott's] note would be a forgery. He added also a note of his own to the effect that Scotch shepherds would never have thought of presenting sixpence to the supposed child in the cradle. Both the insertion and Furnivall's note call for a brief comment.

In the first place the note to which Furnivall alludes is *not* Marriott's but, as we shall see, Walter Scott's, the compiler and editor of the *Minstrelsy*. Further the shepherds were not Scotch as Furnivall suggests, but, as a glance at the text would have shown him, good Yorkshire men. Whether Yorkshire shepherds would have been stingier with sixpences than their Scotch fellows is a question which an American is quite unable to decide. The lamented Eric Knight might perhaps have given the correct answer.

The *Secunda Pastorum* has been reprinted many times since its appearance in the Surtees edition, but, so far as I know, there has been no reference since Pollard's introduction to Marriott's ballad and its relation to the "Mak" episode. It seems worth while therefore to review the matter and to draw certain hitherto neglected conclusions.

Dr. Kölbing's information about Marriott, drawn, he says, from Alibone's *Dictionary*, is singularly incomplete. Had he consulted the *DNB.*, of which the required volume, xxxvi, was already in print, 1893, he would have found the following interesting facts. John Marriott, 1780-1825, educated at Rugby and Christ Church, Oxford, came in 1804* to Dalkeith in Eskdale to act as tutor to George Henry, Lord Scott, heir to the dukedom of Buccleuch. Here he remained until his pupil's untimely death in 1808 when he retired to an English rectory the gift of the Buccleuch family. During this time he came to know and indeed to become on intimate terms with Walter Scott, then living at Ashestiel "in the heart of the Buccleuch estates." It was to Marriott that Scott addressed the Epistle prefixed to the second canto of *Marmion*, 1808, in which he records their walks and talks, "in Classic and in Gothic lore" and remarks that his friend's harp "on Isis strung to many a Border theme has rung." The allusion is, of course, to Marriott's contributions to the *Minstrelsy* and here comes a fact which enables us to date the composition of *Archie Armstrang's Aith* almost to a year. Dr. Kölbing stated that this poem appeared in the fifth

edition of the *Minstrelsy*, 1826. So, indeed, it does, but it had appeared long before, namely in the third edition, 1806, along with another Border ballad by Marriott, *The Feast of Spurs*, and a lyric addressed to the countess of Dalkeith, mother of his pupil, on the occasion of her visit to the ruins of Melrose Abbey.¹ On the basis of his information Dr. Kölbing argued that the ballad could hardly have been composed before 1802, when *The Minstrelsy* first appeared. It is now possible to date it more exactly between 1804 when Marriott came to Scotland and 1806 when Scott included it in the third volume of the third edition of *The Minstrelsy*. It has appeared in all succeeding editions down to the elaborate four volume edition by Henderson in 1902, and it was in the fifth edition, 1821, that Dr. Kölbing came upon it.

The note appended to the ballad in all editions of the *Minstrelsy* is, of course, like all other notes in the collection, by Scott himself, not, as Furnivall seems to have guessed, by Marriott. There is no reference in it to the Towneley play, of which, in fact, there is no reason to suppose that Scott had any knowledge whatever. It is worth while to summarize the important statements in this note of Scott's. "The hero of that ballad," he says, "was a native of Eskdale"—that is in the district where Scott himself was then living—"and contributed not a little toward the raising his clan to that pre-eminence which it long maintained among the Border thieves; . . . at length he found it expedient to emigrate. . . . He afterwards became a celebrated jester in the English Court." Scott identifies, that is, the "hero" with the well-known Archie Armstrong, Court Fool to James I and Charles I; the last stanza of the ballad with its reference to "Charlie, the English King" makes his identification complete.² Scott continues: "The exploit detailed in

¹ This lyric, by the way, is wrongly called a "ballad" in the *Bibliography of the Poetical Works of Walter Scott* (Edinburgh Bibliographical Society Transactions, Vol. I, 1936).

² According to *DNB.*, Archie, date of birth unknown, died in 1672. The author of this article quotes Scott's note for Archie's reputation as a sheep-stealer; but adds that "he was attached at an early age to the household of James VI of Scotland. On his accession to the English throne Armstrong accompanied the King." That, of course, would be in 1603 and if we allow Archie to have been fifteen years old at this time, he must have made his reputation as a thief at a very early age indeed. Certainly he did not find it "expedient to emigrate" but went to England as a member of the royal

this ballad has been preserved . . . by tradition and is at this time current in Eskdale." It is, I think, a perfectly fair inference that the "tradition" was discovered by Scott in one of his many "Border raids" to gather material for the *Minstrelsy* and handed over by him to Marriott to versify. This was almost certainly the case with Marriott's other contribution, *The Feast of Spars*, since that ballad deals with a story told of Walter Scott of Harden, a character who appears in *The Lay of the Last Minstrel*. The "identification" which Kölbing supposed to have taken place in the seventeenth century, so as to connect the "hero" with the Court Fool of Charles I, is in all probability the work of Scott himself who padded out his note by including a jest of the Fool which brought about his disgrace at Court.

Since the Towneley Ms. in which the *Secunda Pastorum* appears was written, according to E. K. Chambers, in the second half of the fifteenth century it is certain that the "tradition," "current in Eskdale" and Scott's time, and the original of both play and ballad is older than the Ms. Is it not possible to show that the modern ballad preserves a form closer to the "tradition" than that which appears in the play? I believe it is.

Let us consider the main outline of the ballad. Archie—the name Armstrong does not appear in the text—with a stolen sheep on his shoulder reaches his home, hotly pursued by the shepherds. His wife warns him that he will be "ta'en the night, and hangit in the morning," but Archie has a trick up his sleeve; he skins the sheep, wraps the carcase in a blanket, and puts it in the cradle of a child which happens to be absent. When the shepherds enter they find him rocking the cradle and crooning "hushabye," to a bairn, "just at the dying." To their charge of theft he replies with a stout denial and with the imprecation that he may be doomed to eat the flesh in the cradle if ever he stole a sheep. After a fruitless search of his house the shepherds depart feeling that there has been some mistake, and Archie to keep his vow "ate the cradled sheep."

All this, it may be noted, is quite in the tone of the Border ballads. They all tend to glorify the daring and craft of the border reiver, whether an Englishman, like Dick o' the Cow, or a Scottish

household. It seems most likely that when Scott discovered the tradition about the sheep-stealing Armstrong—Archie or otherwise—he promptly and wrongly identified him with the famous Court Fool.

rascal like the Harper of Lochmaben who stole the Lord Warden's Wanton Broun. Cattle-lifting, horse-stealing, jail-breaking are laudable exploits to be commemorated in story and in song. There can be little doubt that Marriott did little but versify the "current tradition" which Scott passed on to him.

The Mak episode in the Townely play on the other hand differs from the ballad not only in the conclusion where the thief is detected and punished, but in the very beginning and in various details in the course of the action. Mak, the "hero," introduces himself to the shepherds as a poor man staggering under the burden of superfluous children. In spite of his bad reputation as a sheep-stealer he is hospitably received and lies down to sleep with them. He casts a spell on them, steals a sheep, and takes it home, where Gill, his wife, a worthy mate, quite unlike the frightened woman of the ballad, suggests a trick: the sheep can be hidden in the cradle as a new-born babe, while she lies and groans in a feigned child bed. He returns to the sleeping shepherds and is, apparently, the last to wake in the morning; he then tells them of a dream in the night that his wife has just added a boy to his houseful of children. He departs in peace and at home places the sheep in the cradle, haps his wife in bed, and sits down to sing "lullaby" in anticipation of the shepherds' visit. They are not long in coming, for the loss of a sheep has been discovered and suspicion falls, of course, on Mak. He protests his innocence and laying his hand on the cradle prays that this, the hidden sheep, may be the first meal that he eats, a vow which is echoed by his wife: "I pray to God—if ever I you beguiled that I may eat this child that lies in this cradle." After a vain search of the house the shepherds are departing when the gentlest among them returns to give the new-born babe a gift of sixpence. He lifts up the sheet and discovers the stolen sheep. In spite of the frantic protestations of Mak and his wife that the child has been "changed" by an elf, the truth comes out, the thief is let off with the easy penalty of a tossing in a blanket, and the shepherds return to hear the "Gloria in excelsis" of the Christmas angel.

The points of likeness between the ballad and the play are, as Dr. Kölbing pointed out, unmistakable and since, in the nature of the case, neither could have been derived from the other, it follows that both derive from a common origin, the "tradition" which, as

Scott testified, still lingered in Eskdale. What differentiates ballad and play is the treatment that each accords to this common source. That of Marriot's poem, written under the inspiration of Scott, is simple and direct in true ballad fashion; that of the play is artful, not to say sophisticated, with all the tricks of a practiced playwright: foreshadowing, complication, suspense, and solution. And so indeed it is, for the *Secunda Pastorum* is one of a group of plays in the Towneley Cycle which have been identified as the work of one man, the so-called Wakefield Master, a witty clerk of the time of Chaucer.

It seems highly probable that this worthy was entrusted some time in the late fourteenth century with the job of freshening up the old cycle of Towneley plays for one of their annual performances at the Wakefield Fair. To do this he altered and improved various pageants and composed several new ones, among these that which goes under the name of *Prima Pastorum*. Now this *Prima* is a perfectly satisfactory play as old Miracles go; better in many ways than its companion play in the York cycle. It is a vigorous bit of realism with English shepherds grousing, quarreling over imaginary sheep, eating and drinking like good fellows, before they hear the angel's song. What could have induced the Master to write a *Secunda* to take its place and to become the outstanding example of English comedy before Elizabethan days?

It would seem as if there could be but one answer. In the interval between a performance of the *Prima* and the composition of the *Secunda*, the Master must have come upon an early form of the "tradition" that Scott discovered centuries later still current in Eskdale. Here, he saw at a glance, was the very thing to make a new and merrier Shepherds' play. The story was, in fact, the sort of grotesque parody of the Gospel narrative that medieval art delighted in; the Shepherds would visit the house of the robber and be deceived by a false child in the cradle before they entered the stable at Bethlehem and adored the true Babe in the manger. Only one thing, it may be, troubled the Master. The tradition, no doubt, credited the robber with a successful trick upon the silly shepherds. This, he felt, would never do for a Christmas play. He could not allow his shepherds, who were soon to receive the new message of

the new born Saviour, to be imposed upon by a neighbor.³ And so he was compelled by the very nature of the case to alter the ending and expose the trick. Yet he could not, on the other hand, permit his shepherds of the Nativity to stain their hands with blood, and so, in spite of a cry of one shepherd for weapons, and the threat of another to kill both Mak and his wife, the Master dismisses the thief with a bit of the rough horse play that his audience loved. Here it would seem is the answer to the question that Dr. Kölbing found insoluble. It is impossible, I think, to believe that the Mak episode represents the original form of the tradition and that the simpler and in fact more primitive story in the ballad is a distortion of the original. If for no other reason, and there are many, the matter of the oath speaks against such a conclusion. In the form presented in the ballad this oath, to eat the flesh in the cradle, is the very keystone of the structure. It gives the title which Marriott affixed to his version; it is the means by which the "hero" ratifies his trick to deceive his accusers, and when he is free of their presence he keeps the vow by eating the sheep. In the play, on the other hand, the oath, though present, is hardly noted in the lively patter of dialogue between Mak and Gill and the shepherds, in the wails of Gill from her childbed, in the friendly inquiries as to the child's gossips, and in the vain attempts to pass off the discovered sheep as a changeling child. Needless to say when the shepherds leave Mak's house there is no further mention of the oath. We may suppose, if we like, that Mak comforted his sore bones with a hot bowl of mutton broth. The Master does not say so; his business as a playwright was to get the shepherds to Bethlehem as soon as possible, lest he tire his hearers with a performance already enlarged beyond the normal length. In other words what was the keystone of the old tradition became in the playwright's hands only matter for a momentary jest.

If this interpretation of the relation of the ballad and the play to their common source be the true answer to the question that Kölbing left unsolved it does something more than merely establish

³ It is wrong to think with Wülcker, and others, of Mak as a Scotchman. His patronymic, indeed, suggests a Scotchman to us; but the English borderers then and long after were far more familiar with Johnstones, Armstrongs, and Elliots than with MacGregors or MacDonalds who had not yet descended from their mountain homes to harry the Lowlands.

the ballad as standing closer to the original form. It reveals the Wakefield Master as a dramatist who in his choice of subject, his freedom in handling his material, and his lively *vis comica* stands head and shoulders above all English playwrights up to and even past the time of Heywood.

T. M. PARROTT

Lawrenceville, N. J.

THE FIRE SYMBOLISM IN *MOBY DICK*

A critical passage in *Moby Dick* occurs toward the end of the story, when Ahab grasps the links of the lightning chain, places his foot upon the kneeling body of Fedallah, and addresses the corpusants (St. Elmo's fire) burning from the tips of the spars:

Oh! thou clear spirit of clear fire, whom on these seas I as Persian, once did worship, till in the sacramental act so burned by thee, that to this hour I bear the scar; I now know thee, thou clear spirit, and I now know that thy right worship is defiance. To neither love nor reverence wilt thou be kind; and e'en for hate thou canst but kill; and all are killed. No fearless fool now fronts thee. I own thy speechless, placeless power; but to the last gasp of my earthquake life will dispute its unconditional, unintegral mastery in me. (Ch. cxix.)

The first sentence, which contains the only explanation in the book of the scar described upon Ahab's first appearance,¹ appears not only mystifying, inadequate, and irrelevant, but even Gothic and ridiculous. There is more than a little melodramatic paraphernalia in *Moby Dick* and the idea of Ahab's practising a Persian cult of fire-worship on a whaling vessel might appear to head the list of such monstrosities. Yet this sentence is not irrelevant; nor is it merely designed to magnify Ahab by mystifying the reader;²

¹ "Threading its way out from among his grey hairs, and continuing right down one side of his tawny scorched face and neck, till it disappeared in his clothing, you saw a slender rod-like mark, lividly whitish. It resembled that perpendicular seam sometimes made in the straight, lofty trunk of a great tree, when the upper lightning tearingly darts down it, and without wrenching a single twig, peels and grooves out the bark from top to bottom ere running off into the soil, leaving the tree still greenly alive, but branded." (Ch. xxviii.)

² For example, Melville's indebtedness to the style of Sir Thomas Browne, notable in the final paragraphs of chapters I, LVII, LXXXV, xcvi, civ, cv,

it is the key which explains many paradoxical and confusing references to fire and enables us to relate the fire symbolism to the final, central meaning of the book.

Hints too numerous to mention throughout the story question the orthodox Christian and Transcendental belief in the essential goodness of the universe and in the idea of progress. The sea symbolizes the evil in man which reflects a corresponding evil in reality.³ It is not surprising that such speculations should take Melville to Zoroastrianism, which divides the universe between Ahmazd, the god of light, who is good, and Ahriman, the god of darkness, who is evil—two equal forces in ceaseless conflict. This conception of reality leads to the introduction of the ambiguous harpooner, Fedallah, who acts as an alter ego of Ahab, his evil self;⁴ as Mephistopheles luring Ahab Faust to sell his soul for aid in his vengeance against the white whale; and, finally, as a Parsee—a Zoroastrian fireworshipper. Clearly the presence of Fedallah the Parsee suggests that Ahab has practiced Zoroastrian rites, assisted by him. Since fire represents Ahmazd, the good, to the Zoroastrians, it is difficult to understand how it can also symbolize evil, as it does constantly,⁵ and finally, in the scene of the corpusants, be virtually identified with the malign element in nature that Ahab is opposing. Nor can this paradox be resolved by blending Fedallah's roles of Parsee and Mephistopheles.⁶ It

etc., is revealed in imaginative flights that would justify such an explanation if no more reasonable one could be found.

³ See especially Ch. LVIII.

⁴ See Ch. CXXX, and LXXIII, CXXXII.

⁵ As in Ch. xvi, "The Try-Works": "Look not too long in the face of the fire, O Man! Never dream with thy hand on the helm! . . . believe not the artificial fire, when its redness makes all things look ghastly."

⁶ F. O. Matthiessen, *American Renaissance* (New York, 1941), p. 441, finds a confusion in the symbols which "involves reversals of values that are not always easy to understand. . . . As an instance of the way he made his shifts, you find him first numbering among the sacred associations of whiteness, 'the white forked flame . . . held the holiest on the altar . . . by the Persian fire-worshippers.' Yet when he came to treat the relations between Ahab and Fedallah, he was thinking in terms of a Yankee *Faust*, and the Parsee's power had therefore to be made diabolic. Consequently, fire-worship became a sinister act that had left Ahab scarred for life." I do not think there is any confusion of symbols or reversal of values here, but rather an organic use of them in the dramatic movement of the story, as will be demonstrated.

demands rather an understanding of Ahab's spiritual development through his quest into the nature of things.

Before the opening of *Moby Dick*, Ahab must be assumed to have accepted the Christian belief in the goodness and omnipotence of God. Speculation (or experience—the book moves on both levels) led him to recognize the presence of ubiquitous evil. Still on the side of the good, Ahab ranged himself against evil and even attempted to eradicate it. At this point, when searching out evil, he was smitten, not by evil but by what he had considered the element of good. When Moby Dick severed his leg, when lightning struck him,⁷ when speculation revealed a preponderance of evil in the grand scheme of being—the story presents itself on all these levels of meaning—Ahab turned from a believer in good-menaced-by-evil to the desperate conviction that evil lay at the heart of reality. From a quester he turned to a hater, madly seeking to find and destroy the “unknown but still reasoning thing,” with “outrageous strength” and “inscrutable malice sinewing it” that had injured him.⁸

But Ahab's development does not stop there. The story of *Moby Dick* is not merely the carrying through of this insane purpose to inevitable self-destruction. On another level Ahab continues to speculate and to develop until he comes finally to the higher wisdom of knowing that man's fate must be tragic,⁹ that opposition brings out whatever greatness is his, and that, on the contrary, in a “per-

⁷ Upon Ahab's first appearance, he is described as looking “like a man cut away from the stake, when the fire has overrunningly wasted all the limbs without consuming them. . . .” (Ch. XXVIII.) This description, which appears purely metaphorical on first reading, must also be taken literally.

⁸ Ch. XXXVI. Also Ch. XLI: “No turbaned Turk, no hired Venetian or Malay, could have smote him with more seeming malice. Small reason was there to doubt, then, that ever since that almost fatal encounter, Ahab had cherished a wild vindictiveness against the whale, all the more fell for that in his frantic morbidness he at last came to identify with him, not only all his bodily woes, but all his intellectual and spiritual exasperations. The White Whale swam before him as the monomaniac incarnation of all those malicious agencies which some deep men feel eating in them, till they are left living on with half a heart and half a lung.

⁹ This interpretation has been admirably presented by H. A. Myers, “Captain Ahab's Discovery: The Tragic Meaning of *Moby Dick*,” *New England Quarterly*, Spring, 1942,—an article to which I am greatly indebted.

fect" world man would be no different from the animals. Speaking of the pull toward love that Pip exerts on him, Ahab says, "My malady becomes my more desired health." (Ch. CXXIX.) With this realization the conflict between "good" and "evil" disappears, for these once alien principles are fused in a conception of a Reality that requires and indeed embodies both.¹⁰

The fire symbolism in *Moby Dick* is in complete harmony with these ideas. Ahab first worshipped fire as the destroyer of evil, in the authentic Zoroastrian manner, considering it the principle of light. When doing so he was struck by lightning: fire burned him.¹¹ The burning was the counterpart of his being maimed by Moby Dick, although we must assume that it happened before his fated encounter with the Whale (previously a source of nature's bounty) and that the latter spurred him on from disillusion to indignation and madness. Such an order of events is in keeping with the development of the theme of the book; nor do Ahab's actions after being "dismasted" allow for an interlude of fire-worship. His being burned is the revelation—not yet understood by Ahab—that "evil" and "good" are not separate but One. After this experience Ahab hates the fire as he hates Moby Dick because he considers it essential evil, alien to man and maliciously destructive. As the voyage proceeds and Ahab grows wiser through speculation, he brings his two polar attitudes toward fire together. Addressing the corpusants, he calls fire a "clear spirit" and thus seems to be

¹⁰ Ishmael touches this idea in the Try-Works chapter: "The sun hides not the ocean, which is the dark side of this earth, and which is two thirds of this earth. So, therefore, that mortal man who hath more of joy than sorrow in him, that mortal man cannot be true—not true, or undeveloped." (Ch. xcvi.) Ahab skirts it in his address to the fire of the corpusants and expresses it explicitly in the last chapter, when he is at the point of death: "Oh lonely death on lonely life! Oh, now I feel my topmost greatness lies in my topmost grief." See Myers, *op. cit.*

¹¹ In this connection we may note the symbolism of Ahab's words uttered when he is destroying the quadrant: "Cursed be all things that cast man's eyes aloft to that heaven, whose live vividness but scorches him, as these old eyes are even now scorched with thy light, O sun!" (Ch. cxviii.) It seems probable that Melville intended this fire-worship to have been practiced under the direction of Fedallah, on a previous voyage; but the dramatic requirement of having Ahab smuggle Fedallah aboard, plus the fact of Fedallah's Mephistophelean role and the fact that the mates would have recognized him and thereby lessened his mysteriousness, made it impossible for Melville to be explicit on this point.

calling it good; yet in the same speech he says it is unmoved by love or reverence, that it can only kill, and that it is indifferent to man. Yet he worships it now, even though he proclaims that its "right worship is defiance." This attitude is a great development from his earlier insane hatred of Moby Dick,—a hatred which, curiously enough, must be preserved for the concluding action even though Ahab has in some senses outgrown it.

Ahab, in short, realizes that evil (Emerson would say Fate) cannot be destroyed but that man rises to greatness in struggling with it. More strictly, he realizes the necessity of what he has found to be the nature of being, and he also knows that he is a part of this order, with all its qualities. He indicates the fusion of opposites in the One by saying, "Come in thy lowest form of love, and I will kneel and kiss thee; but at thy highest, come as mere supernal power; and though thou launchest navies of full-freighted worlds, there's that in here that still remains indifferent." And in the next sentence he asserts his affinity with this reality by identifying himself with fire: "Oh, thou clear spirit, of thy fire thou madest me, and like a true child of fire, I breathe it back to thee."¹²

It would have been incongruous for Ahab, at the moment of recognition, to have identified himself with the whale; for this conception the fire is a more expressive symbol. Faced, also, with the dramatic requirements of the chase and the rising tempo of the action which permitted less digression and philosophical extension as the climax approached, Melville set up the accompanying fire-symbol as another string to his bow; with it he could foreshadow, even forestate, his conclusions in a different set of terms, in order to prepare his reader for the implications of the climax. Fire as destroyer and purifier, as in the Phoenix myth, was an obvious complementary symbol to the whale.

Although the fire symbolism greatly enriches the texture of *Moby Dick* and particularly adds depth and force to the idea which emerges at the climax, the corpusants scene may seem to raise a formidable

¹² Ch. CXIX. Not content with this, Melville goes a step further and describes an ultimate power beyond even the fire: "There is some unfusing thing beyond thee, thou clear spirit, to whom all thy eternity is but time, all thy creativeness mechanical. Through thee, thy flaming self, my scorched eyes do dimly see it. Oh, thou foundling fire, thou hermit immortal, thou too hast thy incommunicable riddle, thy unparticipated grief."

question; namely, why, with the wisdom evinced there, did Ahab have to go on to his destruction? Why could he not profit by his tragic insight? How could he ignore his knowledge that good and evil were not separable? The obvious answer—that the tremendous dynamic impetus of the action had to be carried through to its tragic conclusion—merely underlines the question of its probability, even though all aesthetic considerations demand such an outcome. The impetus of the action, however, is such that this scene, occurring some sixty pages from the end, actually participates in the rush toward the climax. It is turning water moving in from the edge of the maelstrom. More important is the fact that Ahab's tragic wisdom cannot fulfill itself merely as wisdom. Conceiving an alien reality in the Fire, Ahab must, like the Phoenix, experience its destruction in order to experience its purification. He attains through action what cannot be merely reasoned; or, if the word "action" has unwholesome connotations, we might say that experience must be concrete or personal to be true experience.¹³ Ahab's glory appears in his tragedy, as he is driven forward by the exasperating knowledge that the inscrutable Other which "heaps" and "tasks" him is indifferent to love and hate alike. Ahab's constant introspection makes him, more than other tragic heroes, a sort of spectator, experiencing catharsis at his own tragedy.

Although the role of fire is thus explained, the role of Fedallah becomes more ambiguous toward the end of the story. On the Faust level he is given an important chapter of prophecies by which

¹³ Melville's recognition that his tragic hero was not caught in the usual net of circumstances from which, after the first fatal step, there was no possible escape, is indicated by his efforts to add another strand to the web of necessity by playing upon the notion that the whole action is *fated*, as in the following passage: "Ahab is for ever Ahab, man. This whole act's immutably decreed. 'Twas rehearsed by thee and me a billion years before this ocean rolled. Fool! I am the Fates' lieutenant; I act under orders. Look thou, underling! that thou obeyest mine.—Stand round me, men. Ye see an old man cut down to the stump; leaning on a shivered lance; propped up on a lonely foot. 'Tis Ahab—his body's part; but Ahab's soul's a centipede, that moves upon a hundred legs. I feel strained, half-stranded, as ropes that tow dismasted frigates in a gale; and I may look so. But ere I break, ye'll hear me crack; and till ye hear *that*, know that Ahab's hawser tows his purpose yet." (Ch. CXXXIV.)

he reassures Ahab in his hellish pursuit.¹⁴ This level underlies the final action and climax. But on the higher level of Ahab's growing insight into reality, Fedallah must be cast off, and he is; his part becomes less significant and Ahab's more imposing. These struggling roles of Fedallah are revealed in the following passage, where the attempt to reconcile them is obviously unsuccessful:

And yet, somehow, did Ahab—in his own proper self as daily, hourly, and every instant, commandingly revealed to his subordinates.—Ahab seemed an independent lord; the Parsee but his slave. Still again both seemed yoked together, and an unseen tyrant driving them; the lean shade siding the solid rib. For be this Parsee what he may, all rib and keel was solid Ahab. (Ch. CXXX.)

But perhaps it is not necessary to reconcile them: Fedallah is not a personality, has no revealed consciousness or point of view; he merely serves as part of the stage-setting in the drama of Ahab's quest.

CHARLES CHILD WALCUTT

University of Oklahoma

BEAU TIBBS AND COLONEL SELLERS

Mark Twain's admiration for Goldsmith's *Citizen of the World* and its influence on his work have been noticed by a number of scholars. In a letter to his brother Orion written March 18, 1860, young Clemens characterized the *Citizen of the World* as one of his two "*beau ideals*" of fine writing.¹ His most obvious imitation of Goldsmith appears in two articles published in the *Galaxy Magazine* for October and November of 1870 under the title, "Goldsmith's Friend Again." In them he used Goldsmith's device of letters from a Chinese to a friend in his own country to attack the inhuman treatment frequently accorded Chinese in America. A number of other parallels between passages in the *Citizen of the World* and episodes from Mark Twain's works have been pointed

¹⁴ Ch. CXVII. Also Ch. CXXX: "Even as Ahab's eyes so awed the crew's, the inscrutable Parsee's glance awed his."

¹ *Mark Twain's Letters*, ed. A. B. Paine (New York and London, 1917), p. 45.

out by Friedrich Schönnemann, who also believes that Goldsmith materially influenced Mark Twain's style and contributed significantly to his philosophy of history.²

A further noteworthy similarity in incident and characterization, which has not previously been pointed out, involves two of their most entertaining characters, Goldsmith's Beau Tibbs of the *Citizen of the World* and Mark Twain's Colonel Sellers of *The Gilded Age*. The most striking parallelism in incident occurs in scenes in which each explains away an obviously cheap and unappetizing dinner to which an unexpected guest has come. Tibbs, who has brought the Chinese philosopher home for dinner, asks his wife about the meal in preparation, tentatively suggesting a turbot or an ortolan; but at her pointed suggestion of ox cheek, he takes the cue and exclaims enthusiastically: "The very thing, it will eat best with some smart bottled beer; but be sure to let's have the sauce his grace was so fond of."³ Similarly when Washington Hawkins arrives unexpectedly at the Sellers's home and discovers that the only food for the evening is to be raw turnips, Colonel Sellers launches into praise of the turnip, and, like Tibbs, suggests the condiment which a nobleman of his acquaintance had eaten with them: "Some people like mustard with turnips, but—now there was Baron Poniatowski—lord, but that man did know how to live! true Russian you know, Russian to the backbone; I say to my wife, give me a Russian every time for a table comrade."⁴

Elsewhere the two similarly display their ingenuity in explaining away an embarrassing circumstance. Both speak of the obvious poverty and wretchedness of their living quarters as in reality evidence of good taste. Among the furnishings of the Tibbs's house the Chinese notices several "paltry, unframed pictures." Tibbs immediately asks: "What do you think of that head in a corner, done in the manner of Grisoni? There's the true keeping in it; it's my own face, and though there happens to be no likeness, a countess offered me an hundred for its fellow; I refused her, for, hang it, that would be mechanical, you know."⁵ Similarly Wash-

² Friedrich Schönnemann, *Mark Twain als literarische Persönlichkeit* (Jena, 1925), pp. 89-98.

³ *The Works of Oliver Goldsmith*, ed. Peter Cunningham (New York and London, 1908), iv, 325.

⁴ *The Writings of Mark Twain* (New York and London, 1907-18), x, 127. The two episodes are remarkably alike in detail as well as in spirit.

⁵ *The Works of Oliver Goldsmith*, iv, 324.

ington notices a dilapidated clock in the Sellers's home. "Remarkable clock," said Sellers. . . . "I've been offered—well, I wouldn't expect you to believe what I've been offered for that clock. Old Gov. Hager never sees me but he says, 'Come, now, Colonel, name your price—I *must* have that clock!' But my goodness I'd as soon think of selling my wife."⁶

Both men attempt to create and heighten the impression of their affluence and importance by a constantly urged secrecy. Beau Tibbs has no sooner met the Chinese philosopher than he mentions confidentially a lucrative employment in prospect for himself: "You shall know,—but let it go no further,—a great secret—five hundred a year to begin with."⁷ Similarly, when Colonel Sellers hints to Washington that he is on the verge of great fortune, he enjoins secrecy: "I've got some prodigious operations on foot; but I'm keeping quiet; mum's the word. . . ." And again, "Here's the Rothschilds' proposition—this is between you and me, you understand."⁸

Both lard their conversations with references to their supposed friendships with persons of social or political prominence: Tibbs with his friend Lord Mudler, the Duchess of Piccadilly, Lady Grogam, Lord Trip, and Lord Swamp; and Sellers with Baron Poniatowski, Governors Shackleby and Hager, and Count Fugier.⁹

It would, of course, be wrong to insist that Beau Tibbs was the only, or even the most important model for Colonel Sellers. The type of character represented by the two is common enough in real life, and it seems very probable that Sellers was in large part drawn from the character of James Lampton, a cousin of Mark Twain's.¹⁰ The similarity between Sellers and Dickens's Mr. Micawber has

⁶ *The Writings of Mark Twain*, x, 87-8.

⁷ *The Works of Oliver Goldsmith*, iv, 317-18.

⁸ *The Writings of Mark Twain*, x, 94, 96.

⁹ *The Works of Oliver Goldsmith*, iv, 317, 318, 321, 323; *The Writings of Mark Twain*, x, 88, 90, 127, 151.

¹⁰ Albert Bigelow Paine in his *Mark Twain, A Biography* (New York and London, 1912), i, 23, writes: "Mark Twain simply put James Lampton on paper when he created Colonel Sellers." See also his remarks, i, 11-12. See also M. M. Brashear's *Mark Twain, Son of Missouri* (Chapel Hill, 1934), pp. 63-67, 70-71, for mention of a William Muldrow whose career as land speculator was not unlike that of Colonel Sellers. Miss Brashear concludes, however, that Muldrow was not the model for Sellers.

also been pointed out.¹¹ In his prevailing cheerfulness and in his constant erection of financial castles in the air Sellers is very much like Macawber, but his constant effort to clothe the drab reality of his poverty and failure is more like that of Beau Tibbs. The best conclusion seems to be that Colonel Sellers was a composite. Mark Twain based his characterization on a living model, James Lamp-ton, but in developing the character he followed suggestions that he had gained, perhaps unconsciously, from Goldsmith and Dickens.

EDWARD H. WEATHERLY

University of Missouri

A NOTE ON THREE LYRICS OF PHILIP FRENEAU

It is at once evident to the reader of "To the Memory of the Brave Americans," "The Indian Burying Ground," and "The Wild Honey Suckle" that the language fits the pattern of the pre-Romantic poets with their *sequestered bowers*, *haughty tyrants*, *rural reigns*, *verdant vales*, and *female fays*. In Freneau's poems one finds, for example, *rural reign*, *tearful tide*, *guardian shade*, and *runder race*. Similarities in phrasing abound in the poems of Thomson, the Wartons, Shenstone, Collins, Gray, and Freneau, and it is an interesting pastime to leaf from poem to poem on the hunt for them.

The rhyme schemes likewise fit the same pattern. That of "The Wild Honey Suckle," *a b a b c c*—though not most popular or typical in the period of transition from classicism to romanticism—appears occasionally from about 1740 on; it is the form of Thomson's "Rule, Britannia!" The *a b a b* form of the other two poems was extremely popular, as evidenced by its use in scores of poems.

Likenesses extend also to the rhymes, with (to name a few) *plain*, *bloom*, *doom*, *morn*, *decline*, *thine*, *lands*, *wave*, *swain*, *vain*, *shade*, *here*, *bower*, *grave*, *rest*, *die*, *fate*, *array*, and *inspire* often appearing. Though some similarity would thus be expected, hardly

¹¹ See Stuart Sherman's comment, *Cambridge History of American Literature* (New York, 1936), III, 14. See also Edward Wagenknecht's *Mark Twain, The Man and His Work* (New Haven, 1935), p. 270 n.

more than a casual investigation of the rhymes of Freneau's best-known lyrics and those of the best-known lyrics of Collins which possess the same or similar rhyme schemes reveals an amazing likeness.

Collins's "A Song from Shakespeare's Cymbeline" and "Ode on the Death of Thomson" are made up of four-line stanzas composed of iambic tetrameter lines rhyming *a b a b* and are thus identical in form to Freneau's "The Indian Burying Ground" and "To the Memory of the Brave Americans." The "Ode Written in the Beginning of the Year 1746" and "The Wild Honey Suckle" are alike in being iambic tetrameter and in having six-line stanzas and differ only in that the stanzas of the former are made up of three couplets and those of the latter of a quatrain followed by a couplet.

The three poems of Collins contain in all 40 pairs of rhymes; those of Freneau, 48 pairs. Of these 40 pairs, 25 pairs or 50 rhymes are matched in the 48 pairs or 96 rhymes of Freneau; of these 50 rhyming lines 18 rhymes are identical,¹ and the remaining 32 are similar.²

In diction the likenesses are less startling; in fact, there is probably as much similarity in the wording of Gray and Freneau or of Shenstone and Freneau as of Collins and Freneau—with one exception. Collins's line "How sleep the brave, who sink to rest"³ appears in Freneau as "Sigh for the shepherds sunk to rest."⁴

H. H. Clark is the only scholar to suggest that Freneau may have been influenced by Collins. He points out that "To the Memory of the Brave Americans" has the form of the "Ode on the Death of Thomson," but has more in general manner of treat-

¹ *Shade, here, rest* (Each appears twice as rhymes in Collins's poems), *dressed, eye, die, tide, doom, say, seen, bloom, plain, dead, there, more.*

² As Collins's *cold*, Freneau's *bold*. In addition to similar and identical rhymes, there are eight pairs of rhymes in Collins which may be said to be approximated in Freneau. Examples are: Collins, *eyes, lies; retire, spire; hours, flowers*—Freneau, *eye, by; admires, aspires; hour, flower*. If these near rhymes are added to the total of identical or similar rhymes, only seven pairs of rhymes in Collins's three poems are not matched (or approximated) in the three Freneau poems!

³ From "Ode Written in the Beginning of the Year 1746."

⁴ From "To the Memory of the Brave Americans."

ment with the "Ode Written in the Beginning of the Year 1746." He goes on to say: "The similarity here is by no means close; it was, I think, rather Collins's mood, his gentle spirit, which may have influenced Freneau in this poem."⁵

The similarities between Freneau and Collins, however, as pointed out in the present study of three poems by each, would seem to indicate that the influence was considerably stronger than has been recognized, and that Collins should be added to the list of English pre-Romantics on whom Freneau modelled his poetry.

V. E. GIBBENS

Purdue University

THE GENESIS OF MARTIN FABER IN CALEB WILLIAMS

Even the most casual reader must notice striking similarities between Godwin's *Caleb Williams* (1794) and William Gilmore Simms's *Martin Faber* (1833). That the criminal novel of Simms grew out of the work of Godwin seems almost certain from a detailed comparison of the similarities of the two books.

First, *Caleb Williams* reveals in autobiographical form the maniacal tendencies of an abnormal character; *Martin Faber* portrays precisely the same thing. Moreover, in order to make their

⁵ "The Literary Influences of [sic] Philip Freneau," *Studies in Philology*, XXII (January, 1925), 1-33. Clark's remarks are brief, and he considers only the one poem of Freneau. He goes to some length, on the other hand, to show the influence of other eighteenth century poets—especially the Wartons and Gray—on Freneau. Tyler, Richardson, Wendell, Parrington, and Pattee make no mention of resemblances between the works of Collins and the American poet. Walter F. Taylor classes Freneau with Gray, Collins, Cowper, and Burns as transition poets between neoclassicism and romanticism (*A History of American Letters*, 62-64) but avoids any commitment as to whether Freneau was influenced by them. An anonymous reviewer in the *Port Folio* of October 17, 1807, said of "The Indian Burying Ground" that "the two last stanzas are in the sweetest style of Collins" (page 253), but he drew no inferences concerning influence. Lewis Leary, who writes in the preface to *That Rascal Freneau* (Rutgers College, 1941) that he has "purposely avoided speculation on Freneau's sources or his relation to any literary movement," refers to this comparison of Freneau and Collins for the only reference to Collins in his book.

works the more effective, both authors have written their stories in the first person.

In the second place, in *Caleb Williams* Falkland confesses his crime to Williams, his close friend.¹ Under the influence of his perverse fate Faber, as Falkland had done, confesses to William Harding, his most intimate friend, that he is a murderer, merely falsifying the details in order to escape detection.²

In the third place, the crimes of both Faber and Falkland are unmasked by their close friends and confidants after long and persistent efforts. It is the long-continued spying and denunciation of his friend and former servant, Caleb Williams, which finally brings about the confession of Falkland.³ Likewise, in *Martin Faber*, it is the ever-present vigilance of Harding, Faber's closest friend, which eventually leads to the unmasking of Faber's crime and to his confession of guilt.⁴

In the fourth place, it is interesting to note that Caleb Williams publicly accuses Falkland of being a murderer, but is not believed;⁵ in the same fashion Harding is not believed when he, because of the promptings of the ghost of the murdered Emily Andrews, denounces Martin Faber as a murderer.⁶

In the fifth place, there is a striking similarity of names in the two works. In *Caleb Williams* Emily Melville dies a lingering death as a result of the cruelties of her cousin, Tyrrel. Emily Andrews, the heroine of *Martin Faber*, is first seduced by Faber and then brutally slain. There is even a similarity in the fates of the two women.

In the sixth place, Caleb Williams loves Falkland and deeply regrets the role he feels compelled to play in the latter's conviction. The long-hounded Caleb has persistently sought to denounce Falkland, believing that such action will bring him peace and satisfaction. At last, however, having made his accusation against the dying Falkland, he is afflicted with undying remorse.⁷ The self-reproach of Harding after Faber's conviction is no less bitter than that of Caleb Williams after Falkland's ruin. The penitent Hard-

¹ William Godwin, *Caleb Williams* (London, 1835), pp. 185-186.

² W. G. Simms, *Martin Faber* (New York, 1837), pp. 82-83.

³ *Caleb Williams*, p. 450.

⁴ *Martin Faber*, pp. 106-133.

⁵ *Caleb Williams*, pp. 382-383.

⁶ *Martin Faber*, pp. 90-91.

⁷ *Caleb Williams*, pp. 448-452.

ing piteously begs forgiveness of Faber for having brought the latter to the gallows for his heinous crime.⁸

Finally, it must be made clear that there are certain major differences between the two works. *Caleb Williams* is a powerful exposé of social injustices and the oppressions practiced by the rich and socially powerful against the poor and socially inferior classes. On the other hand, the author of *Martin Faber* intended to show the ruinous results upon character of improper education, over-indulgence by parents, and poor environmental conditions in general during childhood and early youth.⁹ It is obvious, therefore, that the aims of the two works are different.

The plot of *Caleb Williams* is complicated and digressive; that of *Martin Faber* is simple and straightforward. *Caleb Williams* employs a large number of characters; *Martin Faber* makes use of comparatively few. However, as a work of art the American novel is decidedly inferior to its English prototype. In style Godwin is polished, elegant, a master of expression; the style of Simms, on the other hand, is inclined to be rougher, more crude, and less effective in general than that of Godwin.

FLOYD H. DEEN

Indiana University

THE DOUBLE OF DOSTOYEVSKY

The Double marks Dostoyevsky's first attempt to delve deeply into the mysteries of human psychology, but, despite the high hopes with which he published the book, it did not prove successful and many years later in the *Journal of a Writer*, November, 1877 (ed. Lazhechnikov, p. 456), he confessed,

This story positively did not succeed, but the idea was quite brilliant, and I never introduced into literature anything more serious than this idea. But the form of this story was absolutely not successful. I corrected it afterwards strongly, fifteen years later, for the then "Complete Collection" of my works, but I was then again convinced, that this thing was completely unsuccessful, and if I should now work on this idea and express it again, I would choose a completely different form; but in '46 I had not found this form and was not master of the story.

It is a frank admission of failure, but unfortunately at no time

⁸ *Martin Faber*, pp. 134-137.

⁹ *Martin Faber*, "Advertisement," p. ix.

did Dostoyevsky definitely tell us what idea he was endeavoring to set forth and critics have been no more successful in defining it than in coming to an agreement as to the reality of the second Golyadkin. Many have seen the idea as having some sociological or social content, but it may be merely an attempt to picture objectively the mental disintegration of a man by objectifying his thoughts and aspirations and delusions. The story is almost impossible to visualize and the strange way in which the second Golyadkin appears and disappears will confuse the most careful reader.

Let us look first at a few points in it. At the opening we find Ivan Petrovich Golyadkin in a bad way physically and still more psychically. He has even been to consult a physician, Krestyan Ivanovich, who tells him that he must change his manner of living and not be afraid of society. Apparently in an effort to do this, he hires a carriage to attend the party in honor of Klara Olsufyevna, to which he has not been invited and from which he is turned away for some unexplained reason. After his discomfiture, he wanders around the streets and becomes aware of another man who walks home to his own apartment. He is sure that "his nocturnal visitor was no other than himself—Mr. Golyadkin himself, a second Mr. Golyadkin but completely as he, himself—in a word, what is called his double in all relations." (Ed. Lazhechnikov, p. 218 f.)

The next morning this second Golyadkin appears in his office, directly facing him. It arouses no interest among the other officials that there should be two men of the same name in the office. Dostoyevsky implies that the second is a new man (cf. p. 225), but the conversation of Golyadkin and Anton Antonovich does not take the form which we should expect, had the second Golyadkin been an apparition or had the older Golyadkin made a mistake as to the identity or name of the new official.

That same evening Golyadkin invites his new friend home and the stranger tells a story which is almost certainly that of Golyadkin himself, of his unjust treatment in the provinces, of his coming to Petersburg and of his first assignment to duty in the capital. Yet we have no reason to believe that the senior Golyadkin is now weaving a borrowed uniform or is unsure of his position except for his peculiar illness, his fear of unnamed enemies, and his unexplained scandalous conduct with Karolina Ivanovna. As so often

in his early works, Dostoyevsky avoids a consistent picture of the events preceding the story and plunges into the action without making clear at any time what is the genesis of the present situation. We are asked to accept Golyadkin's attitude and to see everything through his eyes, but the author does not explain to us the real situation.

The two Golyadkins spend the night together, but by morning the guest has disappeared without a trace and Petrushka grimly remarks to his master that "the master is not at home" and only later does he grunt out that the other had left an hour and a half before. Later he makes the cryptic remark "Good people live honorably, good people live without falsehood, and are never doubles" (cf. p. 282). The servant may be alluding to the double or to the intrigues into which his master pushes so zealously.

After this night, the role of the second Golyadkin changes. He is no longer the friendly suppliant. He is rather the successful careerist accomplishing without an effort all that the older man could not gain by intrigue and double-dealing and at the same time the cynical revealer of all that lurks in the back of the senior's mind. He knows at each moment how to exasperate and annoy the first Golyadkin and how to compel him to display to his associates all of his bad sides. Yet it is interesting and perhaps a consequence of the official's insanity that he never notices his rival talking with the other men in the office and the second Golyadkin only appears when he can annoy his rival.

This leads the first Golyadkin to the interchange of letters, but these are never delivered and we are left in the dark as to whether they really exist and whether Petrushka is actually sent to deliver them, or tries to do so.

The confusion continues until Golyadkin is retired and again we are not sure whether this retirement is because of insanity or because of the scandal with Karolina Ivanovna. Then comes the fatal letter from Klara with whom Golyadkin imagines himself in love and by whose father he has apparently been greatly helped. Bem considers this like the others imaginary. Osipov (*Dvoynik*, "Peterburgskaya Poema," in A. L. Bem, *O Dostoyevskom*, I, 44), believes that it may be a practical joke on the part of some rough practical jokers. This is hardly probable for it would introduce a completely extraneous note into the story.

Golyadkin has already had his dream of achieving success and then being confused by his rival who possesses those qualities that he himself is desirous of acquiring. In a sense Golyadkin feels toward the double as Salieri does to Mozart in the little drama of Pushkin, *Mozart and Salieri*. It is a recognition that his own ideals are better than his reality, an unconscious tribute to those sides of his character which he refuses to recognize.

It precipitates however the final tragedy. Golyadkin visits his Excellency and then through a doorway which he took for a mirror appears the second Golyadkin and dominates him exactly as he had dreamed. From there he dashes to the house of Olsufy Ivanovich, and again finds there Andrey Semenovich and the second Golyadkin, whom for a moment he pardons. But then Krestyan Ivanovich appears and takes him off to the insane asylum, while the face of the double long remains behind him in the carriage, until he drops into forgetfulness.

All this makes the second Golyadkin a strange figure. He is treated as definitely real and yet there is no proof that he has a real existence outside of the ideas of the first Golyadkin. He is and he is not almost at one and the same moment. The two Golyadkins really represent the two sides of the character of the first man, the mean and sordid and intriguing official and the collection of memories of the past and hopes for the future that throng around his unhappy head.

It was a startling device that the young author assayed, but it is no more fantastic, even if less palpable, than the assumption of magic caps which render the wearer invisible as in Pushkin's *Ruslan and Lyudmila*, or of the paraphernalia in any tale of magic and of the supernatural. Yet it cannot be convincing. The human intellect is not prepared to see people separate into two beings and move in the same environment. Dostoyevsky never tried it again. Hereafter to express his doubles, he employed devices as in the *Raw Youth*, where Versilov changes from one side of his nature to the other behind the scenes, or in the *Brothers Karamazov*, where the devil appears to Ivan when he is alone and mocks him by throwing at him his own words. Or, as in the *Land lady*, he presents his hero as in a state of delirium where anything is possible.

The goal of Dostoyevsky in this novel is really intelligible. It is to present in objective form the lucid and illucid reactions of an

insane man in his social and business life. It is to express in objective form the actions and the aspirations of a man in conflict with himself. Yet the device chosen is unsuccessful. The human mind cannot visualize this kind of existence. We demand that the second Golyadkin be a real person or an apparition. He is neither and both at the same time. It is idle to discuss whether the letters are real or imaginary. It is idle to discuss whether there are two or one man in the apartment and in the office. We can only read the story and accept the reality as Golyadkin accepted it without asking questions or seeking for definite answers to the question.

We have a real picture of a paranoiac with his delusions and his moments of lucidity. We have one man and two and if we can accept the stories of magic that have existed since the earliest ages of man, we must read this with the same confidence in the integrity and intentions of the author. Our minds refuse to do this. Dostoyevsky himself realized this after the novel was published. He admitted his failure and he went on to find other devices for thus revealing the deepest sides of human psychology, but he did not try again to present them simultaneously to the public in two different but similar bodies. *The Double* is a milestone on the way to his greater works, but it represents a false step which has remained to produce discussion and baffle the reader and the scholar.

CLARENCE A. MANNING

Columbia University

EINZEL = EINZAL

Under *einzel* Grimm's *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (III, 349) has the following entry:

EINZEL, singulus, ein wort, dessen geschichte noch nicht genug aufgehehlt ist und das sich mehrfach veränderte. ahd. begegnet es gar nicht, eben so wenig alts. und ags., den begrif drückt die ahd. zusammensetzung *einluzi* (sp. 229) aus, goth. erscheint das unzusammengesetzte *ainakls*, nnl. *enkel* (sp. 214 *einkel*), neben welchem nd. *entel* auftritt (gramm. 3, 770). *k* und *t* tauschen sonst in deutschen dialecten nicht, und jenem *ainakl* ein alts. *ëntal*, ahd. *einazal* an die seite zu setzen bleibt gewagt; vielleicht gewährte dem *einazal* das adv. *einazêm* (gramm. 3, 11) stütze und für das nhd. *einz* wäre ahd. *einazi* möglich. der sinn von *unicus* rührt an den von *singulus*.

auch mhd. herrscht *einlütze* vor, *einzel* taucht selten, aber sicher in zwei stellen auf:

der richet enzele schaden. *Trist.* 9, 5;
mit einzelen brenden. 488, 12;

9, 5 gibt eine hs. *enzele*, wie gleichfalls im passional und bei *Jeroschin* verdünnt wird, belege folgen unter *enzel*. man erwäge auch das adv. *einzelingen*.

nhd. *einzel* mangelt in den ältesten wörterbüchern, *Dasypodius* hat für singulus *ietlichs besunder*, Frisius *ieder besunder, einer allein*, auch bei *Henisch* kein *einzel*, das bei *Stieler* zuerst verzeichnet ist, es war durch *Luthers* bibel längst befestigt, dessen frühere schriften noch oft verengtes *enzel* setzten: also *dienete Jacob umb Rahel sieben jar und dauchten in als werens einzele tage, so lieb hatte er sie*. 1. Mos. 29, 20; es sol kein einzeler zeuge wider jemand auftreten. 5. Mos. 19, 15. . . .

Later authors add but little to Grimm's statement: Marold's edition of Gottfried's *Tristan* gives further variants in the two verses cited above: *zemzigen* and *etzelichen* (v. 283 in Marold), and *eitelen, einzegen* (v. 19450). Evidently the scribes in question were either ignorant of the word *einzel*, or else they disapproved of it.

As to the derivation of *einzel*, we saw above that Grimm considered the possible existence of an OHG. **einzal*, but decided that this etymology is "gewagt." It was tentatively put forward as early as 1691 by Stieler, the first lexicographer to record the word (col. 369):

Einzel, adj. & adv. ab *Ein* & *Zal* fortè compositum, singulus, particularis, singularis: & individuum. Ein einzeler Mensch, homo unicus, vir privatus: adv. singulatim, particulatim.

Similarly Adelung, 1774 (I, 1624): "Eher könnte man noch glauben, daß *zel* aus *Zahl* zusammen gezogen sey."

This etymology, tentatively advanced because of lack of a more plausible one, is now supported by a number of actual instances in the spelling *einzal*. The work in question is the Josephus translation of Caspar Hedio¹ (1494-1552), whose biography is given in

¹ *Josephi des hochberümpften vnd vast nutzlichen Historici. Zwentzig bücher von den alten geschichten nach den alten Exemplarn fleissig corrigiert vnd gebessert. Siben bücher von dem Jüdischen krieg vnnnd der zerstörung Hierusalem . . . Straßburg. M. D. XXXV. im Mayen.* 14 unnumb. leaves, 329 numbered leaves, 1 blank, 18 unnumbered leaves with Register. With signature pp. a new foliation begins: *Flauij Josephi vom Krieg der*

the *Allg. deutsche Biographie* (XI, 223), without mention, however, of the Josephus translation. It may be pointed out that Hedio, like Gottfried, from whose *Tristan* the earliest instances of *einzel* are cited, was a resident of Straßburg.

The following passages are all from the second part, entitled *Krieg der Juden*:

Dann die geste sy erbetten hetten, warden als einzal vmbracht. So sy wider hinweg gon wolten, dann das geschütz trib steyn biß in Tempel vnd zû den altarn, daruon die priester vnd die, die götlich ampt volbrachten todt fielen, vnd seind der vil die die von den weitgelengsten enden der welt zû der heiligen statt waren, vor den opffern todt bliben (*Krieg der Juden* 99^a); So sy dann weiter dann ein armbrust schuß hindersich wichen, kundten sy den sturm mitt den Böcken nit wören, die on vnderlaß stützten, vnd als einzal etwas schüffen (107^a).

These two instances are of particular importance, since the noun value of *einzel* (i. e. *Einzahl*) is clearly to be recognized. Hedio's translation is at times very free; in the first passage the Latin² (v. l. 3) version, for: *warden als einzal vmbracht*, has: *consumpti tamen erant obiter*, so that *als einzal* translates *obiter*, which may mean 'zufällig,' 'im Vorbeigehen,' 'gelegentlich,' 'dabei,' 'zu gleicher Zeit,' 'sofort.' In the second passage the Latin has: "qui sine intermissione ferientes paulatim aliquid proficiebant," so that *als einzal* is the equivalent of *paulatim*. This word is defined as 'allmählich,' 'stückweise,' 'einzeln,' the last being exactly the present-day meaning of *als einzal*.

Juden vnd der Zerstörung Hierusalem Siben Bücher . . . M. D. XXXV. Ten unnumbered leaves, followed by leaf 331 (instead of 1), 2-176, plus *Register* of 8 unnumbered leaves, *in folio*. Copy in Princeton University Library.

With this was compared the edition of 1544 in my possession: *Josephus des hochberümpften vnd fast nutzlichen histori beschreibers. Zweyntzig bücher von den alten geschichten . . . Straßburg. M. D. XLIIII.* Fourteen unnumbered leaves, 344 numbered leaves, 20 unnumbered leaves, with *Register*. With signature *rr* a new foliation begins: *Flauij Josephi vom krieg der Juden/ vnd der Zerstörung Hierusalem . . . M. D. XLIIII.* Twelve unnumbered leaves, 183 numbered leaves, 9 unnumbered leaves, *in folio*. The passages quoted are given according to the foliation and spelling of the edition of 1535.

² He presumably used the Latin version as a basis, even though he declares on the title-page: "nach den Griechischen Exemplaren restituirt vnd gebessert."

In the next group of examples *ein zal*, *entzal* (without the *als*) is used adverbially:

Erstmals seind sie der sach nit eins geweßen, nachdem sie ein zal vnd nit mit dē hauften, nit on forcht nach gewonheit der Juden här auß lieffen (116^a) = Nam primum ne concordare quidem videbatur eorum consilium, paulatim, et per interualla, et cunctanter, non sine metu exsiliuntium (vi. l. 3): here again *ein zal* renders *paulatim*, dann sy mochten die vorwerck nicht sammentlich, sunder müsten sie entzal brennen (122^a) = nam per partes, non simul omnes porticus incendere valuerunt (vi. 4. 2): here *entzal* is the equivalent of *per partes*. in ein yeder wirtschafft nit minder dann zehen menschen das Osterlamb zū essen pflegten, dann allein oder ein zal gezimpt es sich nit (127^b): = solum enim epulari non licet (vi. 9. 3).

Not much stress is to be laid on the spellings *ein zal* and *entzal* in these three passages: the 1544 edition each time has *einzal* (fol. 119^b, 126^a, 131^b).

In the next group of examples, *einzal* is used as an attributive adjective, with the meaning 'single,' 'individual'; it is not necessary to quote the Latin equivalent:

vnnd also aneinander gefüget, das ein yeder thurn für einen einzaln stein anzusehen was (103^b); ee dann einer ein einzal brot vnd handuol mals hat offenbaren wöllen (111^b); schleiffen yn durch die statt als ob sy sich durch ein einzaln menschen an allen Römern möchten rechen (125^b); verboten was, dz man kein einzaln solt auffnehmen, damitt sy also yr haußgsind mit brächten, yedoch seind die einzaln auch angenommen (126^b); ein grosse menge volcks der yeder ettwas einzals trüg (131^b); waren mancherley vnd fast köstlich, het seülen von einzaln steinen (135^a); es weinet die gantze statt vnd klaget, vmb eins eintzel mans willen (133^a); haben sich die letsten auch in todt geben, der eintzel vnd letste da er über sahe die menge (137^b).

These last two passages are the only ones with the spelling *einzel*: the one on f. 133 reads in the edition of 1544: *eyns eynzalen mans*, and that on f. 137 reads: *der cyntzäl vnd letst*. In the following passage, as it stands, *einzaln* looks like an adverb, but it may be a misprint:

vorwerck von seülen fünff vnnd zwentzig elen hoch, von einzaln weissem marmelstein, vnnd daruff balcken von Cedryn holtz (104^a).

Both editions agree here.

Finally the adverb *einzälich* is to be mentioned, which is not recorded in the *DWb*, whereas Lexer cites two instances of *einzelliche*:

Es fiengen aber erstlich an die einwoner einzölich zûrauben, darnach mit rotten durch das land zûstreyffen (83^b): the 1544 edition has *einzälich*.

For the sake of completeness it may be added that *einzel*, the adjective and adverb with final *-n*, is as old as Luther, who uses both *einzel* and *einzel**n*. Approximately up to the middle of the eighteenth century *einzel* predominates, afterwards the form with *-n* gains the upper hand. In the nineteenth century only Rückert makes consistent use of the form *einzel*: see *DWb* III, 349, 350.

W. KURRELMAYER

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF PHILIPPE DE THAÜN'S *BESTIAIRE*

The *Bestiaire* of the Anglo-Norman Philippe de Thaün¹ is not only the oldest known bestiary in any vernacular tongue but one of the oldest literary monuments in the Anglo-Norman dialect. It is dedicated to Queen Aélis of Louvain, the second wife of Henry I. Since this marriage took place in 1121, this furnishes a convenient *terminus post quem* for the composition of the work.²

The *Bestiaire* was not Philippe's first book. It is preceded by the *Comput*, which was probably written in 1119.³ This means that the poet's connection with the court of Henry I antedates the latter's marriage with the Belgian princess, and his true patron seems to have been the king rather than the queen. In fact, if the *Bestiaire* is dedicated to the queen, it is rather to be supposed that the author followed an intimation of his royal master who thus wished to please his young wife. At all events, Thomas Wright probably hit the mark in his shrewd conjecture that the *Bestiaire* was written within the few years that followed the marriage.⁴

¹ *Le Bestiaire de Philippe de Thaün*, éd. E. Walberg, Lund-Paris [1900].

² *Ibid.*, p. xviii.

³ *Li Cumpoz Philippe de Thaün*, ed. E. Mall, Strassburg, 1873, pp. 24 f.

⁴ Th. Wright, *Popular Treatises on Science written during the Middle Ages*, London, 1841, p. x.

If such is the case, it is likely that, in spite of the dedication to the queen, the book was written primarily for the king, probably at his request or expressed desire, and thus we are led to ask: What interest could Henry I have had in the French translation of the *Physiologus*? For it will hardly do to explain it by the alleged usefulness of works of this type.⁵

It does not appear to have been pointed out so far that this particular branch of study: zoology, wild life, met with considerable interest on the part of the third monarch of the Norman dynasty in England. Henry I, as is well known and sufficiently indicated by the name *Beauclerc* bestowed upon him, was a man of some literary attainments and far in advance of his royal contemporaries; but what distinguished him particularly from the men of his age was his interest in animals and wild life, an interest which far transcended his passion for the chase, great though that was. Let us listen to the words of William of Malmesbury:⁶

Paul, earl of Orkney, though subject by hereditary right to the king of Norway, was so anxious to obtain the king's friendship, that he was perpetually sending him presents; for he was extremely fond of the wonders of distant countries, begging with great delight . . . from foreign kings, lions, leopards, lynxes, or camels,—animals which England does not produce. He had a park called Woodstock, in which he used to foster his favorites of this kind. He had placed there also a creature called a porcupine, sent to him by William of Montpellier . . .

William's statement is confirmed by two references to the same deer-park in the works of Henry of Huntington:⁷

Inde ivit rex ad Wodestoke, ad locum insignem, ubi rex cohabitationem hominum et ferarum fecerat.

⁵ Gaston Paris, *Mélanges de littérature française du moyen âge*, Paris, 1912, p. 84.

⁶ Willelmi Malmesburiensis monachi *de gestis regum Anglorum*, v, § 409, ed. W. Stubbs, II, p. 485: Paulus Orcadum comes quamvis Noricorum regi hereditario jure subjectus, ita regis amicitias suspiciebat ut crebra ei munuscula missitaret: nam et ille prona voluptate exterarum terrarum miracula inhiabat, leones, leopardos, lynces, camelos, quorum foetus Anglia est inops, grandi, ut dixi, jocunditate a regibus alienis expostulans: habebatque conseptum quod Wudestoche dicitur, in quo delicias talium rerum confovebat. Posueratque ibi animal quod hystrix vocatur, missum sibi a Willelmo de Monte Pislario . . .

⁷ *Hist.* (Rolls Series), p. 244: *Epistola de contemptu mundi* (*ibid.*, p. 300).

Post paucos exhinc dies, apud Wodestoke, ubi rex conventum hominum et ferarum statuerat, cum episcopus loqueretur cum rege et episcopo Salesburiensi, qui summi erant in regno, percussus est apoplexia.

All this would seem to show that Philippe de Thaün enjoyed the patronage of Henry I, the naturalist, and that it was with this hobby of his master in view, if not at the latter's express orders, that he composed his *Bestiaire*, which he dedicated to Henry's young queen. How far the strange lore of the *Bestiaire* found credence with Henry, we have no means of knowing. Quite possibly the king was sceptical about the statements he found there, and quite possibly, too, like many moderns, he consoled himself with the thought that the *Physiologus* represented the best and most authoritative that could be had at the time.

ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE

Princeton, N. J.

AN EARLIER TALBOT EPITAPH

Dr. C. F. Tucker Brooke in his edition of *1 Henry VI* (1918) finds evidence as to the date of Shakespeare's revision of the play in the appearance of the Talbot epitaph in iv, vii, 63-71, which closely resembles the list of Talbot's titles printed in Richard Crompton's *Mansion of Magnanimitie* (1599). It was believed that this is the earliest printed source for the epitaph. Dr. Brooke comments on the interest attached to these titles and observes that "unless some earlier printed source than is now known can be found for Talbot's epitaph, it will be hard to establish a date prior to 1599 for the revised play."

An earlier printed source for the epitaph is, however, to be found in the dedication of a poem written by one Roger Cotton, a London draper, and printed at London in 1596. This work is described by the Rev. Thomas Corser in *Collectanea Anglo-Poetica* as follows: "Cotton, (Roger.)—An Armor of Prooffe, brought from the Tower of David, to fight against Spannyardes, and all enimies of the trueth. By R. C. Imprinted at London by G. Simson and W. White. 1596. 4to, pp. 32." The poem is dedicated to Gilbert Talbot, seventh Earl of Shrewsbury, in allusion to whose noble family the author thus remarks:

Yet in so much as the fame of one of your owne most noble progenatours soundeth in our eares to this day, I trust it shall of none be thought amisse, yf I lay him before your Honourable eyes, as an other example. That noble Earle *Iohn Talbot* is the man: who either liued as languishing in idlenes, riot or excesse; nor died as hauing surfited with vaine pleasures, and fonde delyghtes: but of manly woundes receiued in open feelde, after he had valiantly warred foure & twentie yeeres in defence of his Princes right: a death and life most honourable to them that are truly noble and valiant. Euen so this worthy peere, togeather with his valiant Sonne the Lord Lisle, in that sore battle fought at *Castilion* in *Fraunce*, their sweete lyues did ende: where a monument of the Earle remayneth vnto this day, and this inscription folowing ingrauen thervpon.

Heere lyeth the right noble Knight Iohn Talbot Earle of Shrewsburie, Earle of Washford, Waterford, and Valence, Lorde Talbot of Goodritche and Urchingfeilde: Lord Strange of Blackmeare, Lord Verdon of Alton. Lord Crumwell of Wingfeilde, Lord Louetoft of Worsoppe, Lord Furniuall of Sheffeilde, and Lord Falconbridge, Knight of the most noble orders of S. George, S. Michael, and the Golden Fleece, Great Marshall to King Henrie the sixt of his Realme of Fraunce, who dyed at the battle of Castilion neare Burdeaux, Anno 1453.

I find no entry of *An Armor of Proofoe* in the *Transcripts of the Stationers Register*, neither against the names of Gabriel Simson and William White, the printers of the 1596 volume, nor against the name of any other printer during the years 1589-1596. However, the *Short Title Catalogue* of Pollard and Redgrave records three copies of the book, and lists the British Museum, the Bodleian, and the Huntington, as the libraries where these copies are to be found. Moreover, in *The Bibliographer's Manual of English Literature* by W. T. Lowndes (new ed., 6 vols., London, 1864), there is a description of the 1596 edition which gives the following collation:

A, four leaves, being the title and dedication "To the Christian Reader," 1 leaf, followed by the Poem on B and C, four leaves each, and D 3 leaves.

The collation of the copy owned by the Huntington Library is as follows:

A⁴, ff², B-D⁴, D⁴ wanting, probably blank. There are three blank pages in front, and then the title page. The dedication to Talbot begins on sig. A₂ recto. The letter to the Christian Reader is on ff₁ recto, there is a printer's device at the bottom of the page. ff₂ is a blank leaf. The poem begins on B₁ recto, and ends on the verso side of D₃.

The collation indicates that this 1596 volume is a first edition.

Neither the dedication nor the letter to the Christian Reader is signed, and there is no indication of the date of either. However, the autobiographical material contained in the dedication would show it to have been written by the poet, and this no earlier than 1592, since there is in it a reference to Gilbert Talbot as "Knight of the most noble order of the Garter," and Gilbert Talbot was elected K. G. on June 20, 1592.

It is now certain that the Talbot epitaph was in printed form in England in 1596, and that the reviser of *1 Henry VI* could have availed himself of this material then.

The question as to whether or not the Talbot epitaph made its first appearance in England in Cotton's dedication rests on the source from which the poet derived his information. In the dedication Cotton states that the titles are to be found on Talbot's monument at Castilion, near Bordeaux. Crompton makes no mention of a Talbot monument, while Malone volunteers that "this long list of titles is taken from the epitaph formerly fixed on Lord Talbot's tomb in Rouen in Normandy." By reason of negative evidence that Cotton had not been to France, nor had seen a Talbot monument at Castilion, and the fact that Malone does not indicate such a monument at Castilion it may be inferred that Cotton's source for these titles was in England; and further, that the nature of the epitaph would suggest that the source was printed.

Moreover, granting the plausible assumption that Cotton's source was in England, before 1596 at least, and that it was printed, it is not necessary to believe that Cotton's dedication was the specific source employed by the reviser of our play. There is no good reason to doubt that a source available to Roger Cotton would also be available to the reviser, indeed, perhaps even the original author, of *1 Henry VI*.

JOSEPHINE A. PEARCE

University of North Carolina

PARNELL'S "HYMN TO CONTENTMENT"

Parnell's "Hymn to Contentment" is a pleasing but confused poem, the confusion arising from the placing of the center of interest outside the professed subject. The theme suggested by the title and taken up in the opening lines is: Where is Contentment

to be found? How is it to be achieved? The answer given in the second and fourth paragraphs (lines 11-32, 41-8) is, in the main, obvious and conventional: not in ambition, avarice, or adventure but in self-discipline and religion. But it is not for the praise of "lovely, lasting Peace of Mind" or for the failure of ambition, avarice, or adventure to supply it that the poem is remembered. The summary given above omits the longest part of the answer to the question, Where is content to be found? The grief-stricken heart, the poet tells us, turns to nature for consolation and peace, but in vain. Here for the first time the poem comes alive. The preceding lines have been pleasantly flowing but nature is spoken of with real delight:

The silent Heart which Grief assails,
Treads soft and lonesome o'er the Vales,
Sees Daisies open, Rivers run,
And seeks (as I have vainly done)
Amusing Thought; but learns to know
That Solitude's the Nurse of Woe.

Note that Parnell interrupts his description to mention his personal experience in seeking consolation from valleys and still waters. It is likely that he is here referring to his heavy grief at the loss of his wife, who had died two or three years before the poem was published, and to his unsuccessful effort to find in nature consolation for his grief. It is clear from the latter half of the "Hymn" that he ultimately found not only comfort but delight in the physical world; and it seems probable that the "Hymn" is an attempt, as much of Wordsworth's poetry was to be, to find rational justification for this delight.

Shaftesbury's deistic conception of communion with nature would not have satisfied Parnell had he known it; he wanted something more orthodox. Furthermore, the deists' ideas did not tally with his own experience. Nature alone, he had found, was not enough; but when one has subjected one's will to the divine will (41-8) renouncing ambition, avarice, adventure, and the merely sensuous enjoyment of the external world (11-32), when one is "Pleas'd and bless'd with God alone" (56), then one finds Peace of Mind, yes even rapture in nature.

The penultimate paragraph expresses a further idea, which may well have been suggested by the noble ode, "The spacious firmament

on high," that Addison published two years before the appearance of this piece. Lovers of nature, Parnell implies, are right in declaring that the heavens, seas,¹ woods, and fields declare the glory of God. Yet "they speak their Maker [only] as they can"; to make their message clear they "want and ask the Tongue of Man." Thus this paragraph tells what man can do for nature, just as the preceding one had told what nature may do for man. Both paragraphs deal with man's obligation, which is also his delight, to sing the "great *Source of Nature*."

It will be seen, then, that Parnell's pleasing octosyllabics have little to say about contentment. Their real subject and the source of their inspiration is a stronger feeling: the joy that may be found in nature when one has subjected one's will to God.²

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

KEATS'S "TO THE NILE"

In his sonnet "To the Nile," written at Hunt's home in competition with Shelley and Hunt on February 4, 1818, Keats addressed the river:

Art thou so fruitful? or dost thou beguile
Such men to honour thee, who, worn with toil,
Rest for a space 'twixt Cairo and Decan?

The lines are puzzling at first, because "toil" and "rest for a space" evoke a picture of an overland journey between Cairo and India, and on such an unheard-of journey the traveler would not encounter the Nile. Nor would he on the usual sea route from Suez. For part of the year, however, when bad weather closed the gulf of

¹ Any expression of appreciation of the beauty of the ocean, such as is implied in line 67, is most unusual at this time.

² The last paragraph, of four lines, corresponds to and is in part a repetition of an earlier paragraph of the same length, lines 33-6. The first two lines of the final paragraph summarize lines 11-32; the last two summarize 33-48, except that here, as in the immediately preceding paragraphs, it is "Bliss" not Contentment that is achieved. Yet "Extreams" in the third line from the end is presumably contrasted with the golden mean of content. I understand the last line to mean, "Or confess that, in the life of bliss which religion enables one to find in nature, the joys of the next world are anticipated."

Suez, the port for the orient was Kosseir on the Red Sea coast. From Kosseir habitable upper Egypt was reached by a desert march of about five days to Kena, 120 miles distant on the Nile. The sonnet can refer only to crossing the desert from Kosseir to the Nile at Kena, when the travelers would be toil-worn and, straight from the desert, readily beguiled into exaggerating the river's fruitfulness.

Just such a situation as the verses require is described by Claude Etienne Savary:

M. Chevalier, commandant général des établissemens françois dans le Bengale, vient d'arriver au grand Caire par la voie de Cosseir . . . Son vaisseau ayant été frappé de la foudre sur la côte de Malabar, & demâté ensuite à la hauteur de Gedda, il fut forcé de relâcher dans ce port. Ces accidens lui avoient fait perdre la saison propre pour gagner le Suès. . . . Après avoir lutté pendant trois mois contre les vents contraires, & manqué vingt fois d'être submergé, il atteignit Cosseir. Il en partit quelques jours après avec six Européens montés sur des chameaux. [They suffered from the heat of the desert, thirst, hunger, and repeated attacks by Bedouin.] Enfin, après quatre jours et demi de marche, ils arriverent à Giéné [Kena], brûlés par le soleil, dévorés de soif, mourans de faim & de lassitude. Lorsqu'ils se furent baignés dans les eaux du Nil, rassasiés des fruits excellens qui croissent sur ses bords, nourris des productions de la terre féconde qu'il arrose, ils éprouverent un bien-être, un contentement, une joie dont le voyageur qui a traversé les déserts peut seul goûter les délices inexprimables.¹

Excepting the substitution of the Deccan for Bengal (which might be due either to the demands of rhyme or to the channel through which Keats learned the tale), the details and thought of the verses correspond to Savary's story of M. Chevalier's experience. Although many Europeans must have followed the route at times, the only other record known to me of an arrival at the Nile from India is Sir Robert Wilson's *History of the British Expedition to Egypt* in 1801, which does not suggest the sonnet. There is no evidence that Keats read Savary's book (which had been translated into English) but, as Shelley must have drawn upon it for his "Ozymandias," published shortly before in Hunt's *Examiner*,² it seems plausible that Keats heard the story from Shelley.

D. W. THOMPSON

Carlisle, Pennsylvania

¹ *Lettres sur l'Egypte*, Paris, 1786, II, 109-112.

² "Ozymandias," *PQ.*, Jan., 1937.

A FOOTNOTE TO *THE ROAD TO XANADU*

In considering the influence of the ballads upon *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*, Professor Lowes has discussed the tinge of archaism imparted to the diction of the poem. Coleridge's use of "withouten" is especially noted with its probable derivation from a line in *Chevy Chase* as the poet knew it in Percy's *Reliques*.¹

Even stronger evidence that Coleridge's mind was recollecting the rhythms and word patterns of *Chevy Chase* is suggested by a comparison of the following lines:

O Christ! my verry hart doth bleed
With sorrow for thy sake;
For sure, a more renowned knight. . . .
Chevy Chase, 165-7

The very deeps did rot: O Christ!
That ever this should be!
Yea, slimy things did crawl with legs. . . .
Ancient Mariner, 119-21.²

The occurrence of "O Christ!", the use of "very" with the intensive meaning, and the employment of the emphatic forms of "do," are common to both first lines. In each case the second line is of subordinate import and the third line begins with a parallel exclamatory affirmative in an opening spondee.

The stanza in *Chevy Chase* describing the battlefield after the slaughter is as follows:

O Christ! it was a griefe to see,
And likewise for to heare,
The cries of men lying in their gore,
And scattered here and there. (129-32)

When the *Ancient Mariner* describes the appearance of the deck of his ship with the four times fifty men lying where they had fallen, a comparable scene in *Chevy Chase* seems to have occurred to Coleridge, for he wrote:

O Christ! what saw I there?
Each corse lay flat, lifeless and flat. (514-15)

¹ *The Road to Xanadu*, revised edition, 1930, p. 332.

² References are to the 1798 version.

The exclamation "O Christ!" is a very uncommon one in Percy's *Reliques*, being found only in these two passages. It is likewise rare in Coleridge, and two of its three occurrences in his poems are these in the *Ancient Mariner*.

These parallels, supporting an almost exact duplication of the ballad's metrical form here, suggest still more emphatically that, occasionally at any rate, Coleridge's phrasing and rhythm in this poem were being directed by those of the old ballad of Chevy Chase.

FREDERICK F. SEELY

Allegheny College

TOURIST

According to the *NED* the word *tourist* first appeared "c. 1800." But twenty years earlier (1780) an anonymous versifier (probably William Cockin) had written in the "Advertisement" to his *Ode to the Genius of the Lakes in the North of England*:

How the following Ode came to be written it is not here needful to say: But being written, and the author concurring in opinion with some of his friends, that it might yield an innocent amusement to the votaries of a fashionable and innocent object, he consented to have it published. Moved simply by this hope, he throws the piece only into the way of actual tourists.

The two last words were what chiefly impressed a contemporary reviewer:¹

The author of this Ode informs us . . . that he disclaims the idea of offering it to the public as a literary production, and throws the piece only into the way of *actual tourists*. The word *tourist* is, we believe, not to be met with in Johnson's, or any other English Dictionary, though the meaning of it is sufficiently obvious; but as we are not *actual tourists*, unless wandering through the regions of literature may entitle us to that distinction, it cannot be expected that we should receive much entertainment from this poem.

That the *Ode to the Genius of the Lakes* not only planted the word in the language but was also instrumental in fixing it there

¹ *Critical Review*, LII (1781), 234.

is suggested by the fact that in March 1804 the *European Magazine*² plagiarized one of Cockin's longer notes and entitled it "A Hint to the Tourists of the Lakes of Westmorland."

ROBERT A. AUBIN

New Jersey College for Women

AN EARLY QUOTATION FROM SHELLEY

In *The Republican*¹ for 7 April, 1820, there occurs a long quotation from Shelley's *Queen Mab* which Mr. Newman I. White does not list in *The Unextinguished Hearth*. The quotation is to be found in an article by Richard Carlile on the trial of Henry Hunt and others² for conspiracy. It is introduced without any mention of its identity. Carlile simply says: "I subjoin an extract from a poem which is strongly illustrative and applicable to all national religions." He then quotes *Queen Mab*, iv, 168-221. This quotation ante-dates the *Queen Mab* piracy of 1821, and is, so far as I know, the only extended quotation from the poem to appear between 1815 and 1821.

FRANCIS J. GLASHEEN

Danbury State Teachers College

THE AMERICAN LANGUAGE

Sir Herbert Croft, author of the *Young Biography* in Johnson's *Lives of the Poets*, seems to have been one of the first English writers to acknowledge the existence of an American language. In *A Letter to the Princess Royal of England, on the English and German Languages* (Hamburg, 1797) he refers to his projected English dictionary as "my English and American dictionary" (p.

² XLV, 189-190.

¹ Vol. II, no. 12, London, printed and published by J. Carlile.

² "Observations on the trial of Mr. Hunt and Others at York, on a Charge of Conspiracy—Strictures on the Evidence—Speeches of Messrs. Hunt and Scarlett, and Reflections on the Verdict."

3.) The *DAE* records "American dialect" (1740) and "American tongue" (Webster—1789), but Croft's usage is more pregnant, since he gives American the same rank as English.

NOTE: "In American Language" (1802) seems to mean "in plain Speech" (cf. German "deutsch und deutlich"), leaving the earliest instance of "the American language" in the *DAE*. that of 1815, *ibid.*, 1, 41.

STUART ATKINS

Harvard University

REVIEWS

The Works of Edmund Spenser. A Variorum Edition. The Minor Poems, Volume One. Shepheardes Calender, Daphnida, Colin Clouts Come Home Againe, Astrophel, Doleful Lay of Clorinda, Fowre Hymnes, edited by CHARLES GROSVENOR OSGOOD and HENRY GIBBONS LOTSPEICH assisted by DOROTHY E. MASON. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1943. Pp. xii, 734. \$7.50.

The grievous losses which the editorial staff of this work has suffered make the appearance of this latest volume especially noteworthy. Students of Spenser owe Professor Osgood a great debt of gratitude and admiration for the courage and perseverance with which he has carried on this work. And we are glad to see on the title page the name of Miss Dorothy E. Mason who has long worked behind the scenes on this edition.

The format and general character of the Spenser *Variorum* are well established and need no further comment here. The problems of selection and arrangement are formidable, and the limitations of space are so rigorous that the reader tends to forgive omissions and to marvel at the wealth of material collected. From an ideological and aesthetic point of view, the *Calender* would have gone better with the *Complaints* and the *Hymnes* with the *Amoretti* and marriage songs, but we are told that practical considerations of space governed the present arrangement.

In preparing this review I have confined myself to the two points which concern every user of this volume: the accuracy of the text, and the reliability of the commentary and other apparatus.

In every case except that of the *Daphnida*, which follows the

second quarto, the texts of the first quartos have been followed with such meticulous care that even misprints and obvious errors have sometimes been reproduced. Aside from the *Calender*, the only serious mistake which I have discovered in the text is the printing of "and" for "with" in the first Hymn, line 86. In the second Hymn, line 147, the quarto reading "perform'd" has been retained, although "deform'd" is required by the context and supplied by many editors, as the Variant Readings show.

Moreover, the arrangement and typography of the Quartos has usually been imitated with such fidelity that one regrets that the date "1591" at the end of the prefatory letter to *Colin Clout* appears on the same line as the designation of place, day, and month, instead of by itself on the line below, as it stands in the quarto. On pages 186-8 the presence of a running title over the *Doleful Lay of Clorinda* gives a false impression that the *Lay* has a title in the original. It does not.

The Variant Readings are not quite as reliable as the text. I have noticed the following mistakes and omissions:

In *Colin Clout* l. 14, the quarto (a version) reads "shepherd" with a small s, as in the text, not with a capital, as recorded. Commas go unrecorded after "fee" in l. 370, "this" in l. 436, "*Vrania*" in l. 487; and colons after "led" in l. 796, and "reule" in l. 920. In l. 792 a modern *u* replaces the *v* in the reading of "vses" ascribed to the Quarto, and there are several other lapses of this kind. Line 265 reads "more,"; l. 270 reads "*Lunday*"; l. 292 reads "*Colin*", and there are other cases where italics have been omitted in the Variant Readings.

In the Ded. of *Daph.*, l. 12 is misnumbered 13; and there is no record of the comma after "Lyon" in l. 18 of Q2 (the text used for this edition). In the text of the poem commas should have been recorded after "vainesse" l. 34, "beare" l. 67, and "paine" l. 436, and a colon after "fynd" l. 3, and the word division "else where" in l. 52.

In the *Hymnes* a comma should have been recorded after "beleue" in l. 257 of the first hymn, and a period appears by mistake after "great" l. 238 in the third.

The text of the *Shepheardes Calender* is almost a facsimile reprint of the first Quarto, with editing confined to the correction of misprints and punctuation. But the list of Variant Readings is so inaccurate as to affect the usefulness of the text, because the text retains some misprints of Q1; for example, the reading "Eternal night" in the gloss to *November*, l. 165, is reproduced, and the Variant Readings fail to note that it was corrected to "Eternal night" in Q3. When misprints have been corrected in the text, the original reading is sometimes given in the Variant Readings, and sometimes not. The result is that when the reader comes upon such a thing as the spelling "accountp" in the Argument for *October*, l. 4, he cannot tell whether that is the spelling of the first quarto, which it is, or a misprint of the *Variorum*.

Actually I find very few misprints in the text of the poem:

In three cases a modern *v* has replaced the original *u*: *Ded. Epist.* 25.3, and *Nov.* l. 56 read "have" for "haue," and the gloss for *Feb.* 176 reads "figuratively" for figuratiuely." In *Dec.* l. 69 a final *e* has been omitted from "Todestoole." In *July* l. 191 the "theyre" of Q1 is silently emended to "theyrs" as in Q3, 5. This is probably a mistake, since the singular form corresponds to "other" for "others" in the same line. At any rate the variant should certainly have been recorded.

Unfortunately, the text of the glosses is less accurate:

In the gloss for *Feb.* 47, an *e* has been dropped from "downe"; on the Emblem, in l. 14 the "me" of Q1 is silently corrected to "men." March 97.14 reads "becometh" in Q1, although De Selincourt, Renwick, and the *Variorum* all read "becommeth." *April* 50.18 reads "himselfe"; *May* 191 reads "pupill" and *May* 219 reads "craty" in Q1, "craftye" in Q3, and "craftie" in Q5, yet the *Variorum* reads "crafty" with no notice of the variants.¹ In *May* 232 there is no authority for the reading "That gotes," the Quartos read "The gotes." On the *July* Emb., l. 9 Q1 reads "in supremacie" not "is supremacie." And in *Oct.* 78 "Tom piper" of the Quartos becomes "Tom Piper" of nursery rime fame.

It seems to have been the intention of the editors to record all departures from Q1, even to "inversions, repetitions, and misspellings," but, in fact, even so important a variant as the "his" "her" which represents a correction in printing of Q1, is not noted in the Variant Readings, although it is commented upon on p. 696. I have noticed more than a dozen misprints in Q1 which are corrected in the *Variorum* but not noticed in the list of Variant Readings. Some of these are recorded in Professor Renwick's edition. But the editor of the Variant Readings does not ignore that edition entirely, for he disagrees about the mark after "habilities" in the Dedicatory Epistle 20.8, which Professor Renwick describes as an inverted semicolon but the *Variorum* records as a question mark.

In the arrangement of the glosses, the *Variorum* follows modern practise and rearranges the words glossed in the order in which they occur in the text. In every case but one, the disorder of the Quartos is slight and probably without significance. But in the gloss to *April*, the notes to words in lines 92, 99, 73, 82, and 86-7 occur, in that order, between the notes to words in lines 136 and 145. This situation may be the result of after-thoughts on the part of E. K., but it could equally well be the result of a last minute rearrangement of stanzas in the famous Lay to Eliza. The misplaced glosses involve three stanzas, 5-7, of the Lay and may indicate that these three stanzas, in the order 7, 5, 6, stood between stanzas 12 and 13 when the glosses were written. The point seems to have been overlooked by Dr. Roland B. Botting, in his interesting study of the order of composition of the *Calender* (*PMLA*, L, 423-34 and

¹ In checking the texts of the Quartos, I have had access only to the Spenser Society facsimile of Q1 and the Harvard copies of Q3 and Q5. Fortunately these are the most important quartos.

Variorum, pp. 276-7), and it would be missed by anyone who relied on the *Variorum* to report fully the text of the first Quarto.

On the other hand, the unusual use of the small period within the sentence, which is a peculiarity of Q1, is carefully reproduced in the *Variorum*, as it is in Renwick's edition. De Selincourt follows the practise of later quartos of converting it into a comma, colon, or full stop, and as a result he sometimes punctuates sentence fragments as if they were complete sentences. I have noticed only one case in which this period has been inadvertently replaced by a comma, after "sonder" in the *March* gloss 97.14. Otherwise, the punctuation of Q1 has neither been scrupulously preserved, nor have all of the departures from it been recorded, although the intention seems to have been to record such departures in the Variant Readings. Sometimes these changes have considerable bearing on the interpretation of the text, as in the case of the comma after "Hobbinol" in *January*, l. 55. This comma appears in Q3 and 5, but not in Q1, and I do not think it belongs there. At least the reading of Q1 should have been recorded in the list of Variants.

But if the record of Variant Readings is incomplete for Q1, it is entirely inadequate and also inaccurate for the other quartos. This situation is most unfortunate because, as far as I know, the modernizations of Q3 and Q5 have never been taken fully into account by students of Spenser's archaisms. Yet they constitute perhaps the best source of evidence for what was considered archaic or unusual in the language of the *Calender* in Spenser's day. But even the variant readings which are noted cannot be relied upon because they are full of mistakes and misprints. In particular I notice that there is a general tendency to misrepresent the readings of Q3.

The construction of the commentaries, on the other hand, has been done by a careful and painstaking editor. Apparently all quotations of source material have been checked and corrected. Sometimes the text cited has been changed to some better or more easily available edition. For example, in the quotation of Reissert on p. 317, the Petrarch citation is clearly a mistake and the editor suggests the passage probably intended and names his edition. Again, on p. 328, Reissert quotes only a line and a half from Mantuan, and the editor supplies several additional lines which are pertinent.

The notes from previous editions seem to have been collected with considerable thoroughness, and the inclusion of some very early comments suggests that the still unpublished *Spenser Allusion Book* has been utilized. Professor Renwick's important edition of the minor poems has been culled with great thoroughness. Except for some valuable notes on the glosses, and a few editorial comments, everything except the linguistic notes has been included. A good deal has been collected from his introductory matter also, but we

will still have to refer to his edition for his opinion on many points since many comments which appear in his edition are here credited to earlier editors and commentators. But when these have been removed, the volume and value of his contribution to the study of Spenser's minor poems is still impressive. Herford's edition of the *Calender* is also fully represented except for his numerous paraphrastic and linguistic annotations.

I miss from the Bibliography Miss Vere L. Rubel's study of *Poetic Diction in the English Renaissance* (Modern Language Association Revolving Fund Series XII, 1941), and wonder why G. C. Moore Smith's note on "St. Bridget's Bower, Kent," which appears in the Bibliography, is not briefed on p. 328 where the passage is annotated. But on the whole the commentary is thorough and comprehensive.

Cross-referencing and regular editorial comment knit together the miscellaneous criticism much more adequately than in the earlier volumes. Great care has been taken to avoid repetition and save space. The appendixes have been kept to a minimum, and the policy of reprinting articles in full, especially those by the editors, has been abandoned. Those who are interested in special topics, such as the identity of E. K. or of Rosalind, or the philosophy (as distinct from the source) of the *Hymnes*, may find the appendixes too brief to be useful. But research students must go back to the original discussions in any case, and what is given is sufficient, in most instances, for purposes of general reference.

The final rechecking of the typescript or the galley proof, which drains the last ounce of editorial patience, has evidently been omitted; for occasionally a line has been dropped out or a mistake which no proof-reader could be expected to catch, has been let stand. In very few cases are these serious enough to affect the general usefulness of the volume. But I notice, for example, that on p. 279 eight words have been omitted from the quotation of Herford's comment on line 35. The omission begins and ends with the word "even" and anyone who has checked copy can see what happened. Again, on p. 353, seven words have dropped out of the quotation from Renwick after the words "Mantuan's complaint" in the fourth sentence, and the resulting statement is rather startling. Usually these mistakes are unimportant, as on p. 401, of the quotation of Renwick, where a necessary "are" has been silently supplied in line 6, and, in line 13 a "the" has been omitted. Occasionally the sense is affected, as on p. 382, in the quotation of Herford on ll. 37-54, where "enforces" has been changed to "refuses" in line 5. The editorial addition to line 6 of this note "See Kluge's note above" should read "below" since the quotation appears on the following page. One of the most amazing misprints is that of "Ariosto" for "Aristeo" on p. 250 in Renwick's comment on lines 55-60.

The effort to give every author his due sometimes results in the printing of the poorer or less useful note in place of the later and better one. Most of the source hunting of Reissert and Kluge, for example, has been made available in English by later editors. Several times, as on p. 335, lines 187-200, chronological considerations involve an editorial supplying of two pertinent lines which are given by Renwick, but are not here credited to him. On p. 335, lines 217-28, the suppression of Renwick's note is a loss because it supplies several facts not mentioned in the earlier notes cited from Todd and Herford. And on p. 337, where Renwick's comment has been shifted from the text to the gloss, and the beginning has been omitted as covered by Kluge's note on ll. 73-4, what is left is no longer self-explanatory. On pp. 385-6 chronological scruple results in the quotation of consecutive lines from Mantuan in reverse order. Renwick presents a clearer picture of the borrowing by printing the lines consecutively. The notes on the December eclogue omit Renwick's frequent citations of Marot's French, citing instead Morley's translation wherever that is available, so that the reader is presented with parallels partly in English and partly in French. See, for example, the notes on lines 77-90. Sometimes, as on p. 337, gloss 74, the effort to avoid repetition results in unintelligibility, as in the note attributed to Herford. If the information was not to be repeated, reference should have been made to Kluge on ll. 73-4 and Warton on 74. On p. 248, ll. 19-42, where the latter half of Renwick's quotation of Petrarach is omitted, perhaps no harm has been done at that point, but the omission makes unintelligible Renwick's note on ll. 49-53, repeated on p. 250, where the missing part of the quotation is referred to.

Sometimes the editorial instinct is so strong as to defeat the *Variorum* purpose, as on p. 613, where Renwick's discussion is very inadequately represented partly because the editor quoted part of it in his own discussion of the problem on p. 610. On p. 321 there is an editorial note on "Menalcas" in l. 102 instead of a reproduction of Renwick's better note which gives the date of the marriage. On p. 337 Herford quotes only the Greek line. The translation which is substituted should have been credited to Renwick as should also the editorial comment on E. K.'s confusion of two Greek words. Occasionally the square brackets which indicate editorial comment have been omitted, as in the case of the last line on p. 300, and in the case of a good many quotations of source material.

But if the book lacks the fine finish of expert editing, it nevertheless represents a bringing together of scattered materials which is most useful. It will be invaluable to teachers of Spenser, and to their students, for many years to come. It is easier to list mistakes than to describe the accomplishments of the work, and to those who know something of the difficulties under which the editors have labored, any carping about the result must seem the sheerest ingrati-

tude. Whatever its faults, the edition is a landmark in the field of Spenser studies, and if it is used with caution and intelligence it will serve as a foundation upon which much future work can be built.

JOSEPHINE WATERS BENNETT

Hunter College

Sir Gawain and the Green Knight. Re-edited from Ms. Cotton Nero, A. X. by Sir ISRAEL GOLLANCZ, with introductory essays by MABEL DAY and MARY S. SERJEANTSON. Published for the Early English Text Society by Oxford University Press, 1940. \$3.25.

It had been a matter of quiet knowledge among the many friends of the late Sir Israel Gollancz that, off and on through many years, he was engaged upon an edition of the present poem. His assiduity and energy carried him far in this labor of love, but he did not live to see its completion. What he left still to do, his former pupil, Miss Day, has now done. Her loyalty to her teacher has carried her further than the mere collection and stitching together of portions of his work. She has supplemented and revised what her master had done, whenever and wherever the progress of scholarship and the passage of time made change or correction necessary, and not infrequently this has meant sewing quite a new patch on the older garment. Dr. Mary Serjeantson has indeed contributed to the book a section dealing with the language of Ms. Cotton Nero A. X. (though she has not attempted to "localize" the poet's speech with any precision), but the lion's share of the work of getting out the present edition, I happen to know, has fallen upon Miss Day. In pious duty to a revered teacher she has sought to keep herself and her share in the task well in the background. At times, I can imagine, she may have been prompted to delete or change what she found set down, but if so, she never forgot that it was to be Sir Israel's book, not her own. Yet her thorough acquaintance with the works of the poet, her practised knowledge of an editor's task, and her resolve that the final work should be, as far as she could make it, a unit free of those gaps and contradictions that are apt to appear when two editors work on one poem, have made it in some measure her book as well as his.

Text, Notes, and apparently the Glossary, are the work of Sir Israel, though the last two incorporate material published after Gollancz's death, and thus give evidence of Miss Day's revising hand. I have some reason to believe that the text stands pretty much as the first editor left it. Certainly the very large number of emendations, more numerous in this edition than in Sir Israel's

BETS. revision of 1919, indicates that he has been allowed to have his way with the text, and that Miss Day did not feel free to interpose her editorial hand. The essays introductory to the text are, however, the work of the reviser, and since she speaks with the authority of a master upon the *Gawain*-poet, a brief résumé of her views is very much in order.

For a date of the poem we still have insufficient evidence, though for working purposes one in the later decades (Miss Day's "last decade") of the fourteenth century seems safe enough. Miss Day brings forward some new evidence for the chronological order, *Patience*, *Purity*, *Gawain* (with nothing said about *Pearl*), though she feels that a certain interval of time elapsed between the writing of *Purity* and that of *Gawain*. She notes, as did Menner before her, evidence of phraseology in the Cotton Nero Ms. parallel to that of the *Wars of Alex.*, and, indeed, finds additional parallels, but, quite rightly, hesitates to say which author it was who borrowed from the other.

Each reader of *Gawain* and *Pearl* who is familiar with the North-west Midlands has, I suppose, his own private predilections for the locale in which the events of *Gawain*'s sojourn took place, and Miss Day is good enough to give us hers. She would place the "Green Chapel" at Wetton Mill, Staffordshire: to speak more precisely, at the cave called Thursehole, i. e., "fiend's house," situated at the bottom of the valley where Hoo Brook runs into the Manifold River. Such a localization, of course, cannot be proven or disproven. Miss Day remarks, rightly I think, that the Green Chapel was a spot well-known to the poet, who describes it in fullest detail, but, according to Miss Serjeantson (*RES.* 3. 327-8), his language is a more northerly speech than that of Staffs., and in the absence of other evidence, that fact tells somewhat against the identification. I think I could suggest a locale whose speech is closer to that which the poet utters, and whose situation would explain something of the political and social background of its events, but *sum cuique* is a good motto, and I am delighted to see that Miss Day not only has her own views as to the background of the poem, but sets them forth in a fashion that is suggestive, if not completely convincing.

On the sources of the poem, Miss Day presents arguments that are illuminating and, to me, convincing. As scholars have long recognized, two main stories, "The Beheading Game" and "The Temptation," make up its single and unified plot (I use those adjectives advisedly). Variant versions of the "B. Game" are to be found in Irish, O. French, and O. H. German, and of the "Temptation" in the French and in two Italian canzoni possibly derived from OF. romance. But with all this wealth of analogues and variant versions, scholars have been unable to agree as to where the poet got the material of his story and how he put it together.

Professor Kittredge, 'a noble prechour in this cas,' believed that *Gawain*, as we now have it, is largely a rendition in English of an original French poem in which the two stories found a final combination. Directly contrary to his view, which has long held the field, is that of Miss von Schaubert, that the two stories did not exist together in any French original, but were joined by the W. Midland poet himself, and that the lack of skill with which the two parts were put together is evidence that her theory is the true one. Opposed as they are one to another, both these views arise, however, from a single way of regarding not only this poem, but other medieval poems as well. Both Kittredge and the lady from Germany are members of the "Source" school, now beginning, I think, to lose some of its former prestige in the scholarly world. According to those who accept its *Credo*, nearly every work of medieval literature must have a "source" to guide the unbalanced reason or check the wayward fancies of a writer. Thus it comes about that when no direct "source" can be found, the apostles of this school are quite willing to invent one. It has, of course, been proven again and again in the long history of literary scholarship that study of the sources of a poem has led to the discovery of new facts about it (to say this is almost banal), and it is also true that the medieval author was less disposed than his brethren of subsequent centuries to care about the literary virtue of originality, yet the literary virtue of "invention" was not unknown in the medieval centuries. It is to Miss Day's honor that, far more than any previous editor or commentator, she is willing to believe in the inventive power of the *Gawain*-poet, willing to believe that he possessed sufficient intelligence to weigh and then to select the raw material that went to fashion his story, and sufficient taste to weave its strands into the pattern of a plot. Consequently she shows little sympathy for Dr. von Schaubert's argument, *viz.* that the lack of skill with which the parts of the combined story are put together indicates an English origin for *GGK*. (a strange argument indeed), and less for that of Kittredge, *viz.* that all the correspondences and parallels between our poem and its numerous analogues would have had to have been embedded in a direct and immediate French original.

Just how the two stories of the "Beheading Game" and "The Temptation" were brought into combination has puzzled many, but combined they were, and only the poet knows how.¹ Miss Day calls our attention to one way in which the union might have been consummated. Each of the stories, she points out, is a story of a

¹ As far as the mechanics of the plot be concerned, the two parts are united by the device of the Exchange of Winnings, found in no other analogue of the story. Miss Day suggests that if the two stories were originally distinct, the device might have been invented or adapted from some fabliau for the purpose of connecting them.

test, each illustrates one and the same moral obligation: "a promise once given must be kept, even though unforeseen circumstances appear to make death the cost of keeping it." This obvious moral swings the plot of *Gawain* into line with the plots of *Patience*, *Purity*, and *Erkenwald*, each of which illustrates a moral virtue.

I cannot help feeling that Miss Day is right in allowing the poet to have a larger share in shaping the plot of his story than previous commentators have been willing to grant him. It does not seem unreasonable to believe that the poem is what it is in composition and structure not so much because of a hypothetical (very hypothetical) source as because of the poet. He was familiar with French romance, and would, quite naturally, feel free to cull thence what he liked and leave out what he didn't. According to Miss Day, he evidently knew well the *Perlesvaus* (p. xxxi). It is interesting to note that one of the stories which Dr. von Schaubert thinks may have given him the idea of the "Temptation"—that of the hermit and the provost of Aquileia—is also to be found in *The Book of the Knight of La Tour-Landry*, and there is some evidence that the W. Midland poet knew that book. As our knowledge stands at present, one is justified in believing that our author's choice of materials for his story was more eclectic than scholars have supposed, and that the neat family-tree of the descent of *Sir Gawain* given in the Tolkien-Gordon edition should be regarded as a stimulant to our thought rather than a conclusive chart of the way in which the mind of a fourteenth century poet worked.

All that we now know, or can learn from the text, deepens the impression that the poet had a good deal more say in the composition of his own story than the "Source" scholars are willing to admit. No *Ur-Gawain* (French or English) has yet been found—not the faintest trace of one. As Miss Day points out, when the poet speaks of the book that told of Gawain's *anious uyage* (689-90), he cites it as the authority for those very passages which seem to have been of his own composing. Furthermore, when he tells us that he heard the story *in toun*, and that it had been long in the land "locked in leal letters," he also tells us that it was an *outrage awenture* of Arthur's wonders, a strange or unusual tale, *i. e.* one not previously known or accessible to the general run of hearers or readers, and he supports this last statement by the manner of his telling it, which is independent and unhampered, without reference to previous tellers or appeals to precedent authority. One should note that there is no transition whatever between the allusion to the tale locked in leal letters (29-36) and the start of the actual story (37 ff.). The ropes that tie him to that "source" (?) have been cleanly cut, and he is off on his own, running free.

The text of the poem has been more carefully read with the result that the notes at the bottom of the page are fuller and more inform-

ing than those of previous *EETS*. reprints. Trips to the Gollancz volume of facsimiles of 1923 need be less frequently made. For this relief much thanks! One will be less thankful, however, that emendations are more numerous than in any previous edition. Some are ingenious: *W(atz)* for *Ms. With* 1315 can be fairly explained as a case where the eye of poet or scribe was misled by *with* of previous line. But emendation is certainly unnecessary in the following lines: 60, 77, 100, 144, 171 (see *TLS*. Jan. 25, 1941), 508, 660, 769, 835, 862, 864, 867, 877 (where the important *wh* spelling should be kept), 992, 1014, 1028, 1082, 1112, 1145, 1283, 1295, 1386, 1434, 1440, 1623, 1700, 1724, 1738, 1769, 1810 (*your*), 1848, 1941, 2029, 2053, 2055, 2056, 2096, 2110, 2187. There is certainly no need of the extra line 2445* which Gollancz has supplied (if it be he who has supplied it, as I think it is). Some of these emendations irritate one. On 867-8 we are told that the change from *on* to *ouer* improves the metre! It is no duty of an editor to "improve" upon what his author has written. Research subsequent to the "improvement" often has shown that the "improved" line has not been improved at all. In the present instance the change from *on hwes* has eliminated a phrase that may be important in the description of the robe Gawain wears. I mention a few instances where a different punctuation would (in my opinion) present the poet's meaning more clearly or improve the movement of the narrative. A period instead of the comma should stand at the end of 1441. In 1847 Emerson's suggestion of the question mark after *hit-self* seems sensible, as does a comma after *dressed* in 2009. In 1396 *Forze* should certainly be *For ze*.

The explanatory notes are, on the whole, excellent. In this text care has been taken to give credit to previous commentators, though in the note on *scholes* 160 Emerson's "shoe-less, i. e. without mail shoes," certainly deserves some consideration. *for hys mayn dintez* 336 need present no difficulty, if one supposes that Arthur was swinging the ax about in "practice strokes." On 452 the comment that "the syntax is awkward" seems a little naive. The condensed, charged utterance of the poem, much of it in direct discourse, is full of ellipses and parentheses, and never more so than when the G. K. is speaking. Here his speech runs as follows: "to fetch such a dint as thou hast dealt—you have deserved it!—to be readily yielded on New Year's morn." 992 *Ms. kyng* should stand for the emended *lord* for, as Emerson suggests (*JEGP*. 21. 378), the host is assuming the title of "King of Christmas." 1020-23 present an apparent crux that has puzzled many a teacher—and these editors too. As the *Ms.* stands, one would seem to count off in these lines four days, Xmas, St. Stephen's (Dec. 26), St. John's (Dec. 27), Childermas (Dec. 28). Now the last three days of the month were occupied by the three hunts. It certainly looks as if our poet had erroneously made St. John's Day the last of the four

days that precede the hunts. Since Gollancz (?) believes, quite rightly I think, that such an error is unlikely, he is forced to the conclusion that some such line as

With most myrþe and mynstralsye Childermas sued

was omitted. The conclusion is in no way warranted. The timing of the story is clearly explained in a note on these lines in the excellent translation of Professor T. H. Banks. Gawain and his fellow-guests do not retire from the festivities of the 27th until the morning of the 28th (1029). After they retire, all sleep through December 28th. On the morn of the 29th the guests depart to their homes and their host to his hunting, and on the morrow of that same day Gawain's hostess makes the first of her three visits. 1265-7 contain one of the cruces of the poem. To date Dr. Menger's reading of *vysen* (1266) is the most satisfactory solution of it presented, yet it is neither noticed nor alluded to. In 1467 a comedy of errors has been enacted. The writer of the note defines *schafteð* as "set, with long rays streaming across the sky, i. e. the boar-hunt continued all day." He then declares that "the interpretation does not involve, as Emerson . . . and TG. assume, holding that the sun set at this point of the story." Now it was actually Emerson himself who suggested that *schafteð* did not mean "set." Two mutually contradictory statements appear in the note, a renowned scholar is blamed for an interpretation he never advanced, and we are led to believe that the interpretation here advanced is the editor's own, when actually Emerson advanced it!! There is no need to suppose that a line has been omitted between 1511-12. The lady has broken off her question abruptly; the poem presents other examples of incomplete or broken utterance caused by the emotion of the speakers. In 1573 the phrase *Whettez his whyte tuschez* only amplifies the action of "scraping" remarked upon in 1571. Emendation of *trayteres* to *traueres* has spoiled the sense of 1700; see Emerson, *JEGP.* 21.394 and Savage, *Med. Aev.* 4.199. *Titleres* 1726 are the greyhounds, who are also "ticklers," see Savage *PMLA.* 46.175. *dryuez to* 1999 does not, as Napier believed, present any special difficulty: "day drives off the darkness," where *to* has the meaning in the imperative clause "go to!" 2002 *naked* = "those poorly clad": The poet is speaking in general fashion; it is not intensely cold, but there's enough of the north in the weather to make the naked (= "ill-clad," Matt. 25:36) wish for summer. In 2055 on the editor's own showing, it is unnecessary to emend Ms. *3if* to *pus*, if one translates *3if* as in Macbeth 3.4.74. 2226 *bi þat lace þat lemed*. I can see no marked difference between the ax that the G K. holds and the one he carried a year ago. Both had a lace and the implication is that the lace on No. 2 was wound about the handle in the same manner as that on No. 1. We are expected to believe that,

despite the change of scene, the G. K. and his weapon appeared the same. 2318 should contain acknowledgment that Sisam (14th Cent. Verse and Prose, p. 223) was the first to explain the line. 2450 *þat knowes all your knyghtez*, "all your knights know that," i. e. the fact that Morgan had had relations with Merlin. 2482 *mony a venture in vale & venquyst ofte*. Another case of condensed wording, "and many a venture in vale (he had), and overcame often." Insertion of *he* for *&*, and derivation of the last vb. from OF. *guenchir* are alike unnecessary.

Lest I seem to dwell too long upon a censorious note, I would call attention to several brilliant bits of elucidation. In 4 a famous crux, *tried for his tricherie, þe trewest on erthe*, is rendered "distinguished (*tried*) for his treachery, the veriest example on earth." The new reading would make us understand that the poet's reference is to Antenor alone, and would render unnecessary the long note on the trial of Aeneas for the concealing of Polyxena. It is certainly most alluring. In 420 *Let þe naked nec to þe note schewe*, TG.'s translation (ordinarily a good one), of *to þe note*, as "in readiness," ought to yield pride of place to our editors' "part where the short hairs were," lower neck; cf. OE. *hnot*, "close-cropped" (and recollect our poet's fondness for the use of the adjective as noun).

Any attempt to fix or "freeze" the poet's language into a final and settled form for glossary use is foredoomed to failure. Few other English poets have been as cognizant of the penumbra of other possible meanings into which the chief or usual meaning of a word might shade off; few others as sensitive to verbal nuances or associations. Such an awareness of verbal values is proof that he was dealing with a highly imaginative living language current on men's lips, not a jargon resurrected from a speech once spoken, but then dead. Even today in the northwest counties of England something of the poet's speech lives on. Consequently an editor of *Gawain*, remembering that the poet's meaning is often contextual and impossible of being "frozen" into a single definition, must be willing to list not a single, but a number of meanings under a particular word; and must also have frequent recourse not only to *NED.* but to *EDD.* as well. The following remarks upon a few words selected from the Glossary of the present ed. will exemplify the soundness of these caveats.²

byled 2082 is hardly to be der. from OF. *boillir* (E). Der. from OE. *bylgean*, "roar," is one possibility, and another is that it is a verb from ME. *bile*, *byle*, "a boil, swelling." *conysaunce* 2026 here

² In the list below the following abbreviations are employed. B = J. T. Brockett's Dict. of N. Country Words, 1846; E = O. F. Emerson, *JEGP.* 21; L = R. B. Peacock, *Glossary of the Dialect of Lonsdale*, 1869; M = A. Mawer, *Chief Elements of Engl. Place Names*, 1924; R = J. Ray, *A Collection of Engl. Words*, various editions; W = Mrs. Joseph Wright, *JEGP.* 34 and 35.

correctly glossed as "cognisance," and less correctly as "badge," shows us that the poet knew his heraldry, for Planché, *Cycl. of Costume* tells us that the word was sometimes applied to the surcote, jupon or tabard that carried the owner's armorial bearings. *cry* 64, 775 is unglossed, though *kry* 1166 is. *dered* 1460 is not "injured," but as in the dialects "frightened, stunned." For *drof* 1176 cf. L's "procrastinate." *flet* 832, 1653, 1925 does not necessarily mean "hall"; cf. the quot. from *Scots Acts of Parl.* 337 (*N & Q.* 7 Ser. 11. 262), "inner halfe of the hous that is callyt the flett."³ *frayst my fare* 409 may indeed be "ask how I am getting on," but equally well might mean "enquire after my track (or journey)," which is precisely what G. had to do. *for* 2173 is not "waterfall," as E. has shown in his review of TG., but "channel." In 1863 Ms. *for hir lorde* has been emended to *fro*. The analogy of *for Gode* 1822 establishes *for* = "in the presence of" and obviates the need of emendation. *gayn* in *com gayn* 1621 is "come towards to meet with" (W) rather than "promptly." *zarked* 820 conveys the idea of a sudden snatch, a quick jerky motion (*Dict. of N. Riding*, 1928), a meaning more appropriate to the raising of a portcullis than the colorless "opened." *zet* 1894 = "still" is not glossed. So also with *hole* 1569, "a hole" or possibly "a narrow valley." *hore* 743 is rightly "hoary," but in folk-speech is often applied to trees when covered with lichen (M.). The phrase *lif* for *lyf* 98 may be der. from the tournament; cf. Span. *juntaron se cuerpos con cuerpos* (Ayala I. 454), and Froissart's *body to body* (Johnes' *Criticism*, 1839, p. 151). *loke* 2438 might equally well be "lock, knot," as well as "look." *may* 1795 is "wife" not "maiden," see my note MLN. 55. 604. *mery* 1736 may be OE. *mere* "bright excellent" with final *y* for *e* (E.). *mornynge* 1751 may not be "anxiety" but "morning" (E. & W.). If it be not telling tales out of school, it was no less a person than Miss Day who suggested in 2467 the reading *pyn aunt* for *py naunt*. But quite evidently she has not felt free to insert her own excellent emendation, even though the alliteration of the line is vocalic. *olde* 1124 is "eminent, great" (W.). *orpedly* 2232 is "truculently" (W.) rather than "boldly." *pine to* 123 is "difficult to" (R). *race* 2076 is rather "blow, cut" than "attack." Is *reled* 1728 necessarily a pret. 3 pers. sg.? Is it not rather past part. of *NED*'s *reel* v¹ or *reel* v²? Cf. *Pat* 147 for an occurrence of the first vb. I offer the suggestion that *rymez* 1343 may be dial. *rim*, "the peritoneum inclosing the intestines"; in which case the form is plural because the poet knows of the two portions of that organ in mammals; the *parietal* and the *visceral layers*. *ronez* 1466 might safely be glossed as "whin bushes" (B). *sadly* 2409 is here "pleasantly, satisfactor-

³ This meaning of *flet* appears in *Beowulf*, line 1086.—ED.

ily" (E); cf. *Pat.* 442. *sette* 1077, 1971 retains the meaning of ON. *setja*, "place or set in the right direction." *slade* 1159, 2147 may very well be "flat, moist ground in a valley" (L). *sturne* 143 is more definite than the gloss "strong"; W. gives "formidable in bulk, massive." *sweyed* 1429 is "swung to one side, inclined" (B) rather than "moved"; the pack is well-trained: all its members move as one. *pus much* 447, "all this, as follows" (W), should be glossed under one or the other of its members. *wayte* 306, 1186 can perfectly well be our modern "await" rather than "watch, search." W. glosses *wyndow* 1743 as "aperture between the curtains of the bed." *wynne* 2420 seems to me to be better translated "struggle" (W) than "joy." W., quite soundly I think, suggests that *wlonk* 2022 is an adverb. *won* 1238 is certainly from OE. *wun*, "pleasure" (E.), rather than from ON. *van* which gives the colorless and quite false "way, custom." G. certainly has no such "ways" or "customs." For *wonez* 2098 cf. *Roch.-Ross. Gloss.* *woan*, "to haunt as a temporary dwelling-place." *to wrast* 1663 is better glossed by "against the grain" (W.) than the editors' "virtue." *Wrezande* 1706 refers to hounds and not to men, hence E.'s "denouncing" is better than "shouting."

The present edition, combining, as it does, all the brilliant inventiveness of Sir Israel and many of his best inspirations, with Miss Day's sound scholarship and rich experience as general editor of the EETS., unites the virtues of both its makers, and is, therefore, charged with a higher scholarly "potential" than other editions less happily launched. It will have its effect upon all that is written or said in future on the poetry of the Alliterative School.

HENRY SAVAGE

Princeton University

The Concise Cambridge History of English Literature. By GEORGE SAMPSON. Cambridge, England: At the University Press. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941. Pp. xvi + 1094. \$4.50. ("College Edition," \$3.40.)

While this review remained unwritten, other reviewers got promptly to work. With one voice they have acclaimed Mr Sampson's *History* as "a masterpiece," "magnificent," "completely satisfying," "a brilliant compact summary," "fresh and readable," and "a notably powerful book." Your reviewer is at last ready to join the chorus, with some particulars and warnings which the less deliberate brethren were not able to give. Mr Sampson has long been known as a capable editor and vigorous writer. He has carried out the present formidable task as if he had been provi-

dentially designed for it; and also as if it had been no task at all, but a continuous pleasure. He has more than earned our gratitude and praise. But, of course, in using this new resource for teaching and study, we will want to know exactly what we have, and to this question we now turn.

The views concerning the study of literature presented in the Preface are those more fully set forth, and defended, in Mr. Sampson's *English for the English* (1921); and they appear to better advantage in that spirited, excellent, though not unchallengeable book, which every teacher of English ought to know.

The fourteen volumes of the *Cambridge History* become fourteen chapters in the *Concise History*, and the chapters of the parent work become numbered sections within Mr Sampson's chapters. Thus the scope of *CHEL*. is faithfully reflected in the *Concise History*; and, in addition, Mr Sampson has brought the story down to the present time, principally in a fifteenth chapter on "Late-Victorian and Post-Victorian Literature" filling 111 pages, but also in passages inserted in earlier chapters. The *Concise History* is, therefore, far more comprehensive than any other one-volume history of English literature known to your reviewer. That the matter of *CHEL*. has not become a bundle of dry bones may seem to be almost a miracle, though it can be explained. The secret lies in the freedom which Mr Sampson has exercised. His Preface is, on this subject, extremely deceptive. It need scarcely be added that he can have had no intention of misleading the public; but, in fact, he has not written an "epitome," though he thinks he has. He is really as independent in the greater part of the first fourteen chapters as he is in the last. He has written the whole book according to his own lights, views, and standards; saying all that he wants to say in his own lively, vivid, and pointed fashion as he travels easily down the centuries; and not only discarding much, but boldly departing from *CHEL*. wherever that suits his purpose.

Hence this *Concise History* can at no point safely be used as a summary of *CHEL*. And though it reproduces the framework, it does not conform to the scale of *CHEL*. In the original American edition of *CHEL*. (used also later in this review), the chapter on Spenser fills forty-one pages, as against Mr Sampson's two and three-sevenths pages; but the chapter on Pope fills twenty-seven and one-seventh pages, as against Mr Sampson's five and one-seventh. Many other alterations in scale are almost as striking. In general, it appears that Mr Sampson cut away all that he felt he could, in the interest of brevity, but cut more or less in obedience to a considerable variety of reasons having little or no relation to each other. Consequently it is impossible to present them, much more to discuss them, within the limited space here available.

When Mr Sampson says one thing, and *CHEL*. says another, it

is not always easy to determine whether we have a case of unintended distortion or one of deliberate alteration. Your reviewer believes, however, that the great majority of the variations are cases of unintended distortion, arising from the determination to make short, simple, positive statements whether or no. An illustration or two, standing midway between extremes, must be given. Mr Sampson concludes his discussion of *Gorboduc* (p. 241) with the statement that its authors "disregarded the precepts and practice of the Italian followers of Aristotle which insisted on the unities of time and place, and so gave to English tragedy from the beginning that liberty of action which was to be one of its greatest glories." Mr Sampson probably did not mean to say that liberty in itself is a "glory"; but, in addition, J. W. Cunliffe in *CHEL.* (v, 78) says nothing of the Italians or of "glories." He merely quotes Sidney's complaint that *Gorboduc* "is faulty both in place, and time," and continues: "Whether this were accident or design, it secured to English tragedy from the beginning a liberty which all the efforts of Sidney's group of stricter classicists could not do away with." For another instance, W. H. Hutton (*CHEL.*, vii, 168-9) concludes his paragraph on Henry Hammond as follows:

The most valuable of all his work, as literature, are his sermons, models of the best Caroline prose in its simplicity, restraint, clarity, distinction. In his absence of conceits, he shows himself typically a Caroline rather than an Elizabethan. In his avoidance of anything approaching rhetorical adornment, he forms a marked contrast to the school in which we may place the gloomy splendour of Donne and the oriental exuberance of Jeremy Taylor. To write of charity, patience, toleration, befits him better than any other man of his age; and, when theologians and statesmen were wrangling over the limits of the church and the rights or wrongs of the individual in religion, his was almost the first, and certainly the clearest, voice to be lifted up in assertion of toleration as a plain Christian duty and in denunciation of the persecuting spirit as an enemy to religion and truth.

This, becomes, in the *Concise History* (p. 371):

The most valuable of all his extensive works are his sermons, models of the best Caroline prose in restraint, clarity and distinction, and eloquent for a virtue then almost unknown, Christian toleration.

The shades of Taylor, John Hales, and others have definitely less reason to complain against Hutton than against Mr Sampson; and we do not have to ask Hutton, as we do Mr Sampson, what is the difference between "toleration" and "Christian toleration?"

Repeatedly, Mr Sampson does triumph over the difficulties of condensation; and when he fails, he rarely sinks to the level of absurdity exhibited in his concluding sentence on Richard Hooker (p. 168). Nevertheless, he is often guilty of unfortunate distortion; and he often deliberately, yet unfortunately, departs from *CHEL.* The most conspicuous and unhappy instance of deliberate alteration noticed by your reviewer is the whole discussion of New-

man (pp. 677-8); but there are other surprising instances. A number of Mr Sampson's interpolations remind us that he was at work in a time of war (though the violent military language at the foot of p. 270 comes word for word from Saintsbury in *CHEL.*, v, 252); others bear witness to his fondness for very dubious generalizations about literature and artistic creation (for despite his keenness and balance, he is not a rigorous thinker, and has taken up with a dilapidated theory of art); but a few, it should be added, are wholly felicitous. Nothing could be better than his opening sentences on Dickens's birth and early surroundings (p. 766), for which there is not a hint in *CHEL.*: "Charles John Huffam Dickens (1812-70) was born in Portsmouth. His father was Mr Micawber; his mother was Mrs Nickleby."

In his Preface Mr Sampson states that his departures from *CHEL.* are those "necessitated by the fact that some of the original chapters were written over thirty years ago." This fairly applies to his final chapter, which, moreover, is a distinguished and sane critical survey, and to certain passages in earlier chapters, such as the treatment of *Piers Plowman* (pp. 60-3) and the discussion of *The Book of Margery Kempe* (p. 97); but in general the differences between *CHEL.* and the *Concise History* have not been occasioned by the elapse of time. They are to be accounted for, rather, by considerations of style and of critical outlook. In the main, Mr Sampson takes his facts as he found them in *CHEL.*, without revision in the light of subsequent scholarly investigation or discussion, and without looking elsewhere for better sources. To take a single example, in *CHEL.* the treatment of Middle English prose is uncertain and contradictory; and so is it in the *Concise History*. The difference is that the uncertainty and the contradictions become more glaring when presented on the smaller canvas of the *Concise History*. Mr Sampson's freedom, then, and his boldness in exercising it, are limited chiefly to form and interpretation; and he thus achieves liveliness and unity on the surface, without really getting everything on one level, any more than it is in *CHEL.*

It is quite possibly unreasonable to wish that Mr Sampson, since he has not actually written an epitome, had exercised greater freedom. No words will be wasted, therefore, on suggestions after the event; though one consequence of failure to grasp the whole problem of a one-volume *Cambridge History* must be mentioned. Mr Sampson himself very well says that his book "is a guide to reading, not a substitute for reading"; yet it is almost totally devoid of bibliographical apparatus. There is a reference (p. 3) to Mr Sampson's own *Cambridge Book of Prose and Verse: From the Beginnings to the Cycles of Romance*, but your reviewer has noticed nothing else of the kind on any later page. There is also one reference to the *Cambridge Bibliography* (p. 45), and fairly frequent

mention of the bibliographies appended to the several volumes of the first edition of *CHEL.*; but these references do nothing to make good a deficiency which greatly lessens the practical usefulness of the *Concise History*.

Your reviewer has noticed very few misprints—only twenty, to be exact—and none of enough importance to be listed here. But several slips must be mentioned. *The Cloud of Unknowing* is briefly discussed (p. 96) along with Hilton's *Scale of Perfection*, and is said to be "doubtfully his." It is true that this mystical treatise was attributed to Hilton about a century after his death, and that the attribution has been defended as recently as 1924; nevertheless, it is certainly not by him. Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* is said (p. 204) to have been first published in 1561—a mistake for 1621. The "fine sermons" of John Hales of Eton are said (p. 372) to have been published in 1613. One sermon by Hales was printed at Oxford in 1617, but no others, so far as is known, were published during his life-time (he died in 1656). Salmasius is said (p. 450) to have "perished under the cannonading of Milton" in the sixteenth century. Mr Sampson speaks (on p. 454) of "the childless Queen Anne," though she was in fact a childless queen only because all of her seventeen children had died. In speaking inaccurately (following Seccombe in *CHEL.*, ix, 281) of Hervey's *Memoirs* (p. 484), Mr Sampson refers only to Croker's edition of 1848, not mentioning the first complete edition, by R. Sedgwick, 1931. The year given (p. 758) for the birth of Oscar Wilde is 1858—a mistake for 1854. Finally, on p. 832 Mr Sampson accords very high praise to Professor Arnold J. Toynbee's *A Study of History*, but gives the title, twice, as *A Survey of History*, and appears not to be aware that the work is still unfinished. It will be agreed, even though this may not be a complete list of slips for which Mr Sampson alone must be held responsible, that he has achieved a high standard of accuracy in a work of vast scope and multitudinous detail extending to more than 500,000 words.

ROBERT SHAFER

University of Cincinnati

The Critical Works of John Dennis. Edited by EDWARD NILES HOOKER. Volume II, 1711-1729. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1943. Pp. cxliii + 587. \$7.50.

This volume, which includes essays from 1712 to 1729 and an appendix of excerpts and letters as a supplement to both volumes, brings to completion Professor Hooker's monumental edition of the critical writings of John Dennis. It will be a satisfaction to many scholars to have the rare and expensive works of Dennis within easy

reach in a usable edition. But the conclusion forces itself upon the reader of these two volumes that the reputation of Dennis has also badly needed scholarly reconsideration. He has been repeatedly re-discovered by eminent men, but no one has hitherto succeeded in modifying greatly the traditional contempt for this supposed sour slave of the rules. The collection of his works was first urged by Dr. Johnson, and later by Southey. The survey of his reputation given by Professor Hooker indicates that Dennis has had many distinguished readers down through the generations, and some of them, including even such men as Wordsworth and Swinburne, have been truly extravagant in their eulogy. The mere fact that he has won the approval and admiration of so many writers of various literary schools and periods is itself a testimony to some enduring value in his criticism, and raises him distinctly above such men as Rymer and Gildon; Landor even placed him above Dryden, and Swinburne above Addison. Now that his critical writings are accessible in a collected edition, it is certain that his importance, both historical and intrinsic, will henceforth be more generally recognized, and that there will be something of a revival of interest in him.

In his learned and thoughtful introduction Professor Hooker surveys the reputation, the critical theories, and the literary judgments of his author. He follows Dennis through his whole career with sympathy and understanding, but also with calm impartiality. The quarrels of Dennis had their worthy as well as their obviously ignoble aspects. Hooker discusses them candidly and objectively, freely admitting faults and also noting extenuating circumstances. Although no narrative of the bitter literary and personal quarrels of that age is likely to satisfy in all its details every modern specialist, the lucidity and reasonableness of Hooker's exposition will tend to moderate the partialities which Dennis and Pope and Addison arouse in modern students even after an interval of two centuries.

Any historical period may be regarded as the sum total of the individuals living in it, and as intelligible only to the extent that we understand these individuals. The Augustan age must be studied successively from the points of view of its great men, Addison, Swift, Pope, and the rest. Certainly it should be viewed also through the eyes of its great professional critic, John Dennis, who practised his profession over a period of thirty-seven years. Dennis is no guide to the majority opinion of his time; he was too much an individualist to speak for anyone but himself. But he throws light on the important critical issues of the time, and to some extent made history by his own contributions to literary theory. His interest in such a doctrine as poetic justice is no adequate measure of his real importance. He expounded the nature of the sublime; as an interpreter of Milton he anticipated and excelled

Addison, although the latter has received the larger credit because he reached a more popular audience; Dennis was, as Hooker points out, an acute critic of drama, and made illuminating observations on the "comedy of manners," on Dryden's *All for Love*, and on Steele's *Conscious Lovers*, which he condemned; he fought Pope, Hooker thinks, not merely because he was irritated by Pope's satirical references to him, but because he thought Pope was drawing poetry away from its appropriate great subject matter. Hooker concedes that Dennis did not understand Pope; on the other hand, Pope, like the late George Saintsbury, clearly did not take the trouble to understand Dennis, whose nature was not so simple as to be encompassed by a text-book formula. Romanticists have found things in Dennis to admire. But Dennis was neither a Romanticist nor a slave to the rules; Hooker judiciously concludes that he was a sensitive and intelligent Classicist.

As in the first volume, the annotations are thorough and generous, often supplementing the introduction by extended historical discussion of Dennis's ideas. Text and apparatus are analyzed in a fifty-page index of names and subjects. These two imposing volumes, the fruit of years of labor, constitute a mature scholarly contribution of a high order.

LOUIS I. BREDVOLD

University of Michigan

Religion and Empire, the Alliance between Piety and Commerce in English Expansion, 1558-1625. By LOUIS B. WRIGHT. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 190 pp. \$2.00.

Modern students have occasionally wondered whether the sainted shrewdness of 16th and 17th century merchant voyagers could have been real, whether their twin loyalties to God and Mammon were sincere or spurious, "a concession to a prevailing cant." Twentieth-century readers have even some tendency to laughter at the strange union of motives. They find a wry humor in the palpable dichotomy, and laugh in the spirit of superior understanding. In *Religion and Empire* Mr. Wright has undertaken to set forth a sounder view of the paradox.

The voyagers were, in fact, profoundly sincere, both in their religion and in their respect for prosperous trade. Every ship was provided with its quota of chaplains. Whatever the state of a sailor's conscience, he regarded divine blessing an essential item in the inventory of a well found ship. The Reverend John Walker went so far as to institute religious discussion groups on board the ship he served; even Raleigh was interested in converting the heathen and in combating the papacy of Spain in the New World.

"From the first voyage of Martin Frobisher, in 1576, onward, the conversion of the heathen became an increasingly prominent motive in the discussions of westward expansion." At all times the merchants regarded their own motives as being essentially religious.

The chaplains themselves inject something of disinterested idealism into the philosophy of empire, for their salaries, about fifty pounds a year, were very low, and they were urgently discouraged from taking part in trade for private gain. Yet they were eager to join the mariners. So keen was the competition for their posts that the merchants could afford to be very critical of clerical applicants, and one Mr. Sturdivant, in 1609, was refused an appointment despite exceptionally good references, because "he hath a strangling humour, can frame himself to all company, as he finds men affected, and delighteth in tobacco and wine." There was occasional delinquency among the seagoing clergy, but for the most part they maintained a rigid integrity.

The clergy of the time were not reluctant to give advice in temporal matters—this is true, apparently, without distinction of sect. Anglican and Puritan alike plunged into the issue of investment and enterprise. Their influence on the effect of mercantile endeavor was great; their effect on its reputation at home and in the light of history was even greater. Some of the chaplains left records of their journeys which were published to win advocates at court and in the market place. Hakluyt and Purchas, particularly, functioned as the propaganda agents of expansion. John Donne's connections with the Virginia Company have been recognized for some years, and it appears that the companies deliberately employed various members of the clergy as "public relations officers." The good report of the merchants in general, and the reputations of mariners in particular, notably of Drake, are directly attributable to sermons and clerical tracts.

Before 1625 the issue between private and public control of imperial enterprise had been defined. Furthermore, the idea of Manifest Destiny had been clearly and positively stated. "Students of American History sometimes talk of Manifest Destiny," Mr. Wright says, "as if it had been invented by President Polk and his contemporaries. But the Puritans who moved inexorably upon the New World had a belief in Manifest Destiny that makes the later American imperialism look anemic and pale." It was the product of the coalescence of several occasionally opposing stresses: the basically religious nature of the seamen led them to wish for the conversion of heathen peoples; their fervid Protestantism redoubled their vigor against Catholic Spain; their political convictions also contradicted the Spanish influence; and their desire for wealth and trade was served even as they served the Lord. From this plexus of motives, none of which may be said to serve another, for all were equally sincere, emerged the vigorous phil-

osophy of empire which finally determined the nature of the New World.

Mr. Wright has collected many passages in which the various motives of the merchant voyagers appear in sharp juxtaposition. He has not limited himself, however, to an assortment of illustrations of the essential paradox. During the years between 1558 and 1625 there was a coherent development in the philosophy of empire, derived from a happy fusion of religious, political, and mercantile interests, and formulated with some degree of self-consciousness by the clerical representatives, official and unofficial, of colonial companies. This development Mr. Wright has made clear.

The book is cast in its original form, that of seven lectures delivered at the University of Washington under the auspices of the Walker-Ames Foundation in April, 1942. The notes have been printed together at the back of the book, and there is an adequate index.

HENRY W. SAMS

Queens College

Coleridge's 'Hymn before Sunrise.' *A Study of Facts and Problems Connected with the Poem.* By ADRIEN BONJOUR. Lausanne: Imprimerie la Concorde, 1942. Pp. 236.

Dr. Bonjour's book is another in the lengthening series of studies focusing on single or related poems by Coleridge and investigating all the pertinent circumstances of their antecedents, conditions of composition, and interpretation. It is admittedly and enthusiastically in the Lowes school of methodology, since Bonjour studied under Professor Lowes at Harvard before completing the present work as a dissertation at Lausanne; and it arrives at some results which should be interesting and provocative to Coleridge specialists.

Bonjour's main purpose is to place the poem in its proper relationship to what he calls the "Dejection Crisis" and to explain certain of its problems and mysteries from this viewpoint. Though perhaps his historical survey of Coleridge's intellectual development, domestic tribulations, physical illnesses, and spiritual moods during the decade or so preceding the writing of the poem is unduly detailed in view of the many biographical treatments of the subject now available, he has nevertheless collected into one usable place all the material bearing on this aspect of Coleridge's life.

The crux of the discussion is found in what Bonjour frankly calls Coleridge's "plagiarism"—particularly his very great and acknowledged indebtedness to Friederike Brun's "Chamounix beyrn Sonnenaufgange," first pointed out by De Quincey. This plagiarism Bonjour explains, partly psychologically and partly medically, as being due to Coleridge's desire, conscious or unconscious, to prove to him-

self and the world that he had recovered his "shaping spirit of Imagination" after he had thought it lost forever. Since, according to medical authorities, the result of a constant and prolonged addiction to opium is frequently a blunting of both the will and the moral sense, Coleridge—perhaps arguing to himself that he had added enough to the original poem of a practically unknown poet to make it his own—weakly attempted to conceal the main source of his work, although openly calling attention to his more general debts to Milton, Thomson, and the Psalms.¹ To these previously recognized literary influences, Bonjour then adds two possible new ones of his own: Helen Maria Williams (in her *Poems* and her *Tour of Switzerland*) and Bishop Thomas Burnet (in his *Theoria Sacra*, Coleridge's knowledge of which Lowes had already demonstrated in *The Road to Xanadu*). Fortunately Bonjour is not inclined to make too much of these parallels, though they contribute their share to the general picture.

In a work printed in English by a foreign press one realizes the difficulty of achieving mechanical perfection. Nevertheless, when, at the climax of a lengthy discussion of the relationship of the newly discovered manuscript of the poem (labeled "*MsH*") to the other manuscripts, one comes upon such a characteristic typographical slip as "we think that the evidence in favour of *MsH* being an intermediate version between *MsB* and *MsH* [read, presumably, *MsF*]" is so strong that no real alternative could possibly be given," then one is justified in protesting against the very inadequate errata list which has been inserted.

ARTHUR H. NETHERCOT

Northwestern University

The Connecticut Wits. By LEON HOWARD. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1943. Pp. xiii + 453. \$4.50.

Mr. Howard has made a detailed study of the literary output of four men who were members of a larger, somewhat nebulous group known as the Hartford or Connecticut Wits. John Trumbull (1750-1831), Timothy Dwight (1752-1817), David Humphreys (1752-1816), and Joel Barlow (1754-1812) were all destined to achieve distinction in their lives, although their efforts to create an

¹ This little idiosyncrasy of Coleridge's in concealing certain aspects of his writing which, if recognized, might damage a position he has visualized for himself should surprise no one who is familiar with the alterations and suppressions he introduced into the revised editions of many of his prose works, particularly in those passages dealing with his early political philosophy. For a complete discussion of this matter, see the dissertation by Dulany Terrett, *Coleridge's Politics, 1797-1810*, on file at the Deering Library, Northwestern University.

enduring literature were doomed to failure. As the result of their literary efforts they produced the not inconsiderable total of seventy-five books, besides numerous miscellaneous pieces. Mr. Howard scrutinizes these published works, "not verily for their own sakes," but as representative of the intellectual life and literary pretensions of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. He rightly maintains that exact knowledge of this complex period of our national history is essential if we would understand later literary and cultural developments.

Partly for reasons of economy in space and money, the author dispenses with footnotes. He appends a Check List of the writings of Trumbull, Dwight, Humphreys, and Barlow (pp. 413-426), and Bibliographical Notes for each of his ten chapters (pp. 429-439). The decision to cut documentation to a minimum frees the story to flow without interruption and gives the pages a pleasing appearance. It unfortunately imposes a burden on the reader who may question the facts.

The story begins with an account of Yale College from the year 1763, when John Trumbull entered as a Freshman, to the year 1778, when Joel Barlow, youngest of the four, was graduated. As Mr. Howard says, "The story of Yale, as it affected the Connecticut Wits during their student days, is not a simple one," but he manages to make it one of the most attractive chapters in the book. We learn not only how each one was affected by the formal courses of study, but also of the influence upon him of extra-curricular activities. We hear of inadequate presidents and of tutors who provoked students to revolt; of the library collection in which Trumbull read extensively as a graduate, but which was available to undergraduates only at high cost; and of the disappointment of Dwight, the ambitious tutor, when another man was made president of the college. We are told that Humphreys responded cordially to that part of the curriculum which featured the beauties of rhetoric; and that Barlow was least affected by Yale orthodoxy. All four made progress on what Trumbull called "the flowery road to fame."

Trumbull, the satirist, was first to turn off that road. He produced *The Progress of Dulness* and *M'Fingal*. He later collaborated with his friends in writing *American Antiquities*, but since satire and law did not mix well he prudently and without apparent struggle laid aside his pen to become an eminent jurist in the commonwealth which revered "things as they are."

Timothy Dwight, clergyman, schoolmaster, and eventually president of Yale, wrote much, but his work was untouched by humor and his mind unleavened by imagination. Present day readers leave *Greenfield Hill* and *The Triumph of Infidelity* untouched, although they will browse through the two volumes of travel notes he wrote on his vacation trips through New England and New York.

The other men went farther afield. David Humphreys, honest, superficial, vain, and slow of mind, became minister to Portugal and Spain before he developed a lucrative woolen industry in Humphreysville. He kept on writing through life, as a gentleman should, but what he wrote was mainly rhetoric and today is unread.

Joel Barlow went abroad on business and became involved in revolutionary activities. He numbered among his friends Mary Wollstonecraft and Tom Paine. Deeply stirred by the misery of European social conditions he too wrote an answer to Edmund Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, which he called *Advice to the Privileged Orders*. It is the most important of his political utterances. Most of his literary work is well forgotten, but the bitter poem "Advice to a Raven in Russia," written just before his untimely death in Poland, is apropos today. Barlow is easily the most appealing figure of the lot, for his sympathies and faith kept pace with his mind.

It may seem presumptuous to point out that if Robert Fulton married a "young English woman of fortune" (p. 331) it is Mr. Howard's business to supply the proof for this statement; or to mention that *American Antiquities*, Number 11, appeared first in the *Connecticut Courant*, August 6, 1787, ten days before the date of publication given on page 195.

Mr. Howard disclaims any intention of producing a definitive work, but he has put scholars in his debt by his masterly handling of difficult material. He has succeeded superbly in making his "test bore" through the intellectual strata found in the writings of the Connecticut Wits. It is not his fault that the men themselves remain more interesting than anything they wrote.

LOUIE M. MINER

Brooklyn College

Margaret Fuller Ossoli e i suoi corrispondenti. By EMMA DETTI.
Firenze: Felice Le Monnier, 1942. Pp. 370.

This Italian biography, with its appended treasure-trove of letters in three languages, repeats in its general outline the familiar, romantic, and often moving story of the New England transcendentalist and humanitarian, Margaret Fuller. Like antecedent histories of this dynamic woman, it relies heavily upon the *Memoirs*, published records of the Concord group, and also upon the extraordinary collection of her correspondence in the Harvard University Library. Miss Detti, presumably, does not excel certain other biographers in her study of Margaret Fuller's relations with Emerson, Hawthorne, or other New England contemporaries; indeed, much still remains to be done with these subtle intellectual sympha-

thies and antagonisms. Quite naturally her emphasis does not rest upon such problems, nor upon the equally difficult question of the integration of Margaret Fuller's thought with the whole complex pattern of transcendentalism.

Her contributions, however, are as valuable as they are unique in the critical history of the New England group. First, she throws light upon puzzling incidents in Miss Fuller's life abroad, notably upon her affair with the miserable cad, James Nathan, and upon her friendship with the distinguished Pole, Adam Mickiewicz, who is allotted only a few sentences in the most recent biography in English. Of this episode, supported by eight letters of Mickiewicz in the Appendix, Miss Detti remarks acutely:

A noi pare stranissimo che i Biographi della Fuller abbiano completamente trascurato il personaggio di cui ora parleremo. Forse il tono delle lettere da lui dirette a Margaret riusciva poco gradito ai puritani?

In similar fashion Miss Detti is able, unlike the American biographers, to define with comprehension Miss Fuller's association with Mazzini.

This brings us naturally to Miss Detti's second attainment in her study of Miss Fuller; for the first time she makes the life and experience of Margaret Fuller in Italy realities. Knowledge of the places concerned and instinctive comprehension of the European personalities, with whom this gifted product of a Unitarian and Jeffersonian Massachusetts family had such unusual companionship, enable Miss Detti to reveal Margaret Fuller, as we have long wished to see her, through the eyes, so to speak, of this older culture. No previous delineator of Margaret in the Italian setting has been quite at ease. Miss Detti is; she understands the world into which the Cambridge dreamer and humanitarian was so strangely projected. The result is actually the first discriminating record of Margaret Fuller's development after her exit from high-minded but (see Henry James!) provincial Concord.

ANGELO LIPARI

STANLEY T. WILLIAMS

Yale University

Tennyson in Egypt: A Study of the Imagery of His Earlier Work.

By W. D. PADEN. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Publications, Humanistic Studies, 27, 1942. Pp. x + 178. \$1.75.

Beginning with an examination of the epigraphs and the footnotes to Alfred Tennyson's poems in *Poems by Two Brothers*, Mr. Paden has extended his investigation of sources to a con-

sideration of what light choice of images in the poetry up to the publication of *Maud* (1855) may cast on Tennyson's mind from youth through "retarded adolescence" to "emotional maturity" (p. 88). From the science of psychiatry he employs three concepts "now considered by psychiatrists to indicate processes which are normal, fundamental, and omnipresent in the human mind" (p. 13). These are "repression," the relegation of certain ideas, images, etc., to the "unconscious" level of the mind, from which they seek to burst; "substitution," the disguised appearance of these ideas, etc.; and "ambiguity," the fact that an image, etc., may have attached to it two attitudes corresponding to the two levels of the mind. Also Paden has considered carefully the ways in which images are selected, recollected, and changed in use. He is aware of the dangers inherent in his type of investigation and has applied his method with great moderation. His conclusions are as follows:

The pattern of his [the youthful Tennyson's mind] . . . was not uncommon in kind, though it was unusual in depth and intensity of emotion. In the constricted circumstances of his adolescence his appetites for sensuous pleasure were suppressed and repressed, to a rather unusual degree, by his idealism, his piety, and his fears. The forces of suppression and repression seem to have been symbolized, in his imagination, by his father (pp. 15-16).

In general, Mr. Paden makes his points convincingly, although one would like more evidence than can in the nature of things be forthcoming about the role Tennyson's father played in his mind. He has interesting suggestions to offer on particular matters, especially about the puzzling circumstances of the publication of *Poems by Two Brothers* (pp. 20-21), the attraction and influence exercised by the Oriental work of Sir William Jones and Claude-Étienne Savary (p. 30 ff.), the role of Cleopatra in the "Dream of Fair Women" and its background of imagery (p. 49 ff.), the psychological reasons for the Byronic prose (p. 54 ff.), the influence of Byron on Tennyson (p. 60 and p. 137 f.), and Tennyson's probable use of Faber's *Origin of Pagan Idolatry* with its relation of Arthur to the Helio-Arkite explanation of pagan mythology (p. 76 ff.). On the whole, *Tennyson in Egypt*, though the title is somewhat precious, is a scholarly and thoughtful book.

FRANKLIN D. COOLEY

University of Maryland

This is Lorence, a Narrative of the Reverend Laurence Sterne. By LODWICK HARTLEY. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1903. Pp. xii + 302. \$3.00.

Mr. Hartley's intention was to write a book about Laurence Sterne "light enough to do justice to the Shandaic mood and to be

acceptable to the palate of the lay reader, yet accurate enough to be of value to the student of the eighteenth century and of the English novel." To achieve this dual purpose with complete success is difficult; Mr. Hartley does very well.

He does not pretend to discover new facts. After a critical assessment of material already accessible, he tells with sympathy and understanding the story of Sterne's life and of his career as an author. Students will find eminently sane analyses of Sterne's relations with such contemporaries as Warburton, Mrs. Montagu, Mrs. Sterne, Lydia, Miss Fourmantelle, Mrs. Draper (Mr. Hartley is especially good on Sterne's relations with women); they will find a careful chronological study of the composition and publishing of *Tristram Shandy* and *A Sentimental Journey*. On serious critical problems Mr. Hartley is disappointing. He is, for instance, over-literal in his treatment of the indebtedness to Locke, interesting but limited in his consideration of Sterne's complex presentation of time, conventional in his literary estimates. Walter and Toby Shandy, those supreme embodiments of the "Shandaic mood," are not presented critically at all, and are not sufficiently in evidence. *A Sentimental Journey* fares better than *Tristram Shandy*.

But we must remember Mr. Hartley's intention. He is more satisfactory as a biographer, telling anecdotes with nice selection, with verve and flavor. Why a book on Laurence Sterne should be called *This is Lorence* may at first mystify the lay reader, but the incident explaining the title is characteristic of Sterne's self-conscious irony. It is questionable whether referring familiarly to Sterne (even after maturity) as "Laurie" gives the reader any sense of intimacy, and Mr. Hartley shows strain in attempting to give dramatic immediacy in a few instances where Sterne himself is silent; but there are few faults of this kind. *This is Lorence* is uniformly interesting and entertaining; Mr. Hartley writes with ease, with a sprightliness which enhances the quality of his anecdotes and which seldom becomes merely whimsical.

W. B. C. WATKINS

Sewanee, Tennessee

The Patterns of English and American Fiction: A History. By GORDON H. GEROULD. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1942. Pp. x + 526. \$3.00.

Anyone who is not an ideological fanatic will find this a most delightful and profitable guide. Its interests are broader, and its tone is pleasanter, than those of earlier one-volume histories of fiction. It is not chiefly concerned with expounding the supposed influences

of political or economic movements, nor is it ridden by the theory that in novels realism is always preferable to romance. Professor Gerould's tastes are as catholic as they are sound, and he is more desirous to interpret the precise qualities which make certain novels admirable than to argue about the environmental causes which affected them. If his book has any regrettable limitation, it is that he says less than he might have said concerning the underlying philosophical views or moral principles of such writers as Sidney, Fielding, and Jane Austen. But it is of course his privilege to concentrate upon the aspects of human life which his authors portray, and their craftsmanship; and these matters, as well as the personality of the writers, he sets forth with admirable skill. To appreciate his superiority over his predecessors, read, for example, his pages on Scott and on Dickens.

Professor Gerould rejoices in the richness and variety of English and American fiction. To him the historical novel, or the novel of adventure, is as welcome as the realistic and contemporaneous,—provided it recreates the life it professes to portray, with zest and fidelity; provided its characters are really human beings; and provided its settings are in harmony with the tone of the whole story. His judgments are refreshingly independent. He sometimes praises authors who are too little remembered (e. g., Mrs. Gore, Marryat, Marion Crawford), and sometimes condemns others whom it is fashionable to exalt (Joyce, Virginia Woolf). It takes courage to speak the blunt truth that there is turgidity in Hardy's *Dynasts*. Professor Gerould does not try to be iconoclastic; most of his verdicts are in agreement with the best critical traditions. Yet he deflates several celebrities, and consistently deprecates the over-emotional, the violently sensational, and the boresomely purposive.

ERNEST BERNBAUM

University of Illinois

BRIEF MENTION

Down-East Spirituals and Others. Collected and edited by GEORGE PULLEN JACKSON. New York: J. J. Augustin (1943). Pp. iv + 296. The brief caption which is thus recorded on the cover of this new and interesting volume is augmented on the title-page by the announcement of "Three Hundred Songs Supplementary to the Author's *Spiritual Folk-Songs of Early America*." In 1937 Professor Jackson issued a collection of religious songs thus entitled, and containing about one half of the spiritual songs that he had found in the southeastern states. At that

time he had begun to speculate, without much conviction, on the possibility that many of the "white spirituals" of the South had been current in New England before they had appeared in the rural song-books of the southern states. In the intervening years Professor Jackson's persistent zeal and his generous determination to find where truth was hid—whether in the Centre, in the South, or in the North—impelled him to an examination of the old song-books of New England and eastern New York; and in the upshot he has found that much of the religious "folk-song" of the Southeast was current a generation earlier in the northeast or "down-east" section which includes Maine, Vermont, Massachusetts, and eastern New York. As to the proportion of true folk-song in any such collection we may still look to Professor Jackson for the information which his previous work has taught us to expect from him. "Fairly reliable data," he states, "has been found as to the authorship of about one-third of the song texts in this volume." The Methodist hymnody is bound to derive from the mid-eighteenth century and the authority of the Wesley brothers, whereas the Baptist singing groups, older in point of time, were free both in the matter of text and in that of music. I wish that Professor Jackson, in commenting on the important distinction, had not found it convenient to use the term "folky" (G. *völkisch*) for the popular traditions of the Baptists. But I have no other quarrel with him. In his impressive array of songs, tunes, and excellent notes, he has done me, and all other students of traditional singing, a great service; and in his clear demonstration that the priority is to be found in the Northeast rather than in the Southeast he has presented a picture which is both strange and true, and one which Sir Andrew might consider of equal interest to Christians and to ordinary men.

W. R. MACKENZIE

Washington University

An Outline of Modern Russian Literature (1880-1940). By ERNEST J. SIMMONS. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1943. Pp. vii + 95. Prof. Simmons is to be congratulated on this successful attempt to outline the history of Russian literature since the passing of the Golden Age of the Russian novel about the time of the death of Tsar Alexander II and he is particularly happy in his summary of the period prior to the Russian Revolution. He has grasped the salient features of the leading writers and has expressed them very well. His summary of the Soviet literature is also one of the best brief descriptions that we have but the material is extremely refractory and the constant shifting of Soviet critical judgment under the pressure of political considerations makes it

very difficult to prepare an independent or non-partisan opinion. Thus the final chapter, *Recent Trends in Soviet Literature*, discusses books written during the periods covered in Chapters VIII and IX and in this respect almost seems an afterthought.

The author is trying faithfully to maintain the Soviet point of view even at the risk of being unjust and false to the values of the outside world. Thus in his discussion of Socialist Realism, he says: "The difference between the Soviet realist and the bourgeois realist is essentially a difference between faith in life and lack of faith" (p. 73). Such a statement is both true and false. True, if we accept the highbrow writers of the last years as essentially all that bourgeois society can produce. False if we look at the great numbers of writers of America, England, and other countries who during the past centuries have believed that their countries and their civilizations were on the whole fairly satisfactory. The popular literature of America until recent years has always been marked by faith. It is only as the modern writers have sought to adapt the methods of the older intelligentsia of Russia that they have come to value a book by its lack of faith. The great asset of Soviet literature, whether aided by censorship and coercion or by the hope of sales and popularity, has been a return to a healthy condition of acceptance of the social order instead of an atmosphere of discontent and criticism that marked the history of the older Russian literature after the time of Pushkin. There are a few errors and misprints as the name of the book by Pantaleimon Romanov, *Comrade Kislyakov* (p. 55) but on the whole the work is excellently edited and printed. It will be a most valuable addition to the library of Russian works in English and should find many readers and students.

CLARENCE A. MANNING

Columbia University

Mary-Verse in Meistergesang. By SISTER MARY JULIANA SCHROEDER. The Catholic University of America (Studies in German XVI), Washington, D. C.: The Cath. Univ. of America Press, 1942. Pp. xvi + 283. \$3.00. This dissertation deals with a little known phase of late MHG literature: the literary, historical and theological aspect of the recurrence of the Virgin Mary theme in the German *Meistergesang*. After a thorough discussion of the history of the Virgin Mary cult, as instanced in many prayers, hymns and festivities, such as Nativity, Immaculate Conception, Annunciation, Visitation, Purification, Presentation, Assumption, and Coronation, the author shows the recurrence of these themes in the poems of the *Meistergesang* and the changes they had undergone during the late Middle Ages. In this devotion, which is shown to have never been theocentric in character, the *Meistersinger*

had resorted to the Bible and the Apocrypha as their source of inspiration. Quite interesting is e.g. the interpretation of *conceptio* through such men as Hans Sachs, Hans Folz and Lienhard Nunnenbeck. The material is culled from 470 poetical documents, manuscripts and early prints. Of particular value is that group of manuscripts which appears here for the first time (*viz.* MSS Berlin 414, Breslau iv F 88 B). Since the texts fortunately are not standardized, they will be of further use for the study of the *Schrifttum* in its various phases. Well documented and presented convincingly, this book is a valuable contribution to the history of MHG literature. A very rich bibliography on *Meistergesang* and the cult of the Virgin Mary in the Middle Ages enhances the value of this dissertation.

Hunter College

CARL SELMER

CORRESPONDENCE

GRETE'S BAD NAME AGAIN. A slight bit of information may be added to Professor Archer Taylor's interesting article on the bad implications of the personal name Grete.¹ St. Margaret, the patron of persons named Grete, is occasionally represented, in art, as seated in prison, with her dragon. An instance of this is a little separately printed anonymous woodcut, probably Dutch, and dating from the last decade of the 15th Century.² It occurs to me as possible that iconographic representations of this kind may have connected St. Margaret with prisons, and her function as Nothelfer, especially asked for easy delivery in childbirth, is certainly connected symbolically with her imprisonment, for the holy lady was herself a virgin. The name might be appropriately given to girls born in prison, though I know of no evidence that it actually was so given. In any case the idea of connecting St. Margaret with girls of bad character because of her picture seems consonant with the popular thought of the old days, delighting in symbols.

THOMAS OLLIVE MABBOTT

Hunter College of the City of New York

¹ *MLN*, LVIII (1943), 452 ff.

² Schreiber, *Handbuch der Holz- und Metallschnitte* (Leipzig, 1930), VIII, p. 94, no. 1616c; reproduced in Heitz Series, *Einblattdrucke des Fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Strasbourg, 1933), LXXVIII, no. 16. The representation is not frequent.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The English list includes only books received.]

Baldwin, T. W. — William Shakspeare's small Latine & lesse Greeke. *Urbana*: U. of Illinois Press, 1944. 2 vols., xviii + 753; vi + 772. \$15.75.

Clemens, Cyril. — My chat with Thomas Hardy. Introd. by Carl J. Weber. *Webster Groves, Missouri*: International Mark Twain Society; *London*: T. Werner Laurie, Ltd., 1944. Pp. 31. \$2.00.

Jackson, George Pullen. — White and Negro spirituals, their life span and kinship, tracing 200 years of untrammelled song making and singing among our country folk, with 116 songs as sung by both races. *New York*: J. J. Augustin, 1943. Pp. xiv + 349.

Roberts, Charles W., Harris, Jesse W., and Johnson, Walter G. — A handbook of English. *New York*: Oxford University Press, 1944. Pp. xii + 292. \$1.35.

Sill, Edward Rowland. — Around the Horn, a journal. Ed. Stanley T. Williams and Barbara D. Simison. *New Haven*: Yale U. Press, 1944. Pp. x + 79. \$2.00. (Yale U. Library Miscellanies IV.)

Whyte, John. — American words and ways, especially for German Americans. *New York*: The Viking Press, 1943. Pp. xvi + 184. \$2.50.

Williams, Edna Rees. — The conflict of homonyms in English. *New Haven*: Yale U. Press, 1944. Pp. xii + 130. \$3.00. (Yale Studies in English, 100.)

GERMAN

Hagboldt, Peter, and Kaufmann, F. W. — Basic German Reader. *Boston*: D. C. Heath & Co. [1943]. viii, 150 pp. \$1.40.

Heine, Heinrich. — Buch der Lieder. *New York*: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co. [1944]. 256 pp. \$2.50.

Hohlfeld, A. R. — Umlaut und Reim. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Theorie des deutschen Reims. [*Monatshefte für Deutschen Unterricht XXXIV*]. *Madison, Wis.*: Univ. of Wisconsin, 1943. 39 pp.

Wagner, A. M. — A Century of Research on Lessing. Past and Future of Modern Languages. [*Modern Languages XXV*, 5-19]. 1943.

— Who is the author of Lessing's "Education of Mankind"? [*Modern Lang Rev.* XXXVIII, 318-327]. *Cambridge, England*: University Press, 1943.

Whyte, John. — American words and ways, especially for German Americans. *New York*: Viking Press, 1943. xvi, 184 pp.

Wieruszowski, Helene. — Das Mittelalterbild in Goethes "Helena." [*Monatshefte für Deutschen Unterricht XXXVI*, 65-81]. *Madison, Wis.*: 1944.

FRENCH

Apollonio, M. — Molière. *Brescia*: "Morcelliana," 1942. 193 pp. L. 15.

Clark, R. E. and Poston, Lawrence, Jr. — French Syntax List. *New York*: Holt, 1943. xvi + 271 pp.

Claudel, Paul. — L'Annonce faite à Marie. Ed. A. Lytton Sells and C. M. Girdlestone. *Cambridge, Eng.*: Univ. Press [*New York*: Macmillan], 1943. xx + 128 pp. \$1.25.

Lindner, G. D. — Marcel Proust: Reviews and Estimates in English. *Palo Alto*: Stanford U. Press, 1942. xviii + 314 pp. \$3.50.

Montchrestien, Antoine de. — *Les Lacènes*, a Critical Ed. by Gladys E. Calkins. *Philadelphia*: U. of Pa., 1943. 162 pp.

Nicot, Georges. — Blitz French, a Handbook of Action French for the Fighting Forces. *Harrisburg, Pa.*: Military Service Publishing Co., 1943. 136 pp.

ITALIAN

Altamura, A. — L'Umanesimo nel Mezzogiorno d'Italia. Storia, bibliografie e testi inediti. *Firenze*: "Bibliopolis" (Bibl. dell' "Archivum Romanicum"), 1941. 203 pp. L. 80.

Annali genovesi dopo Caffaro e i suoi continuatori. Vol. I: Jacopo da Varagine—Anonimi—Giorgio Stella. Ediz. italiana con note critiche e una avvertenza di G. Monleone. *Genova*: A cura del Municipio, 1941. 298 pp.

Anonimo Trecentista. Storia di Fra Michele Minorita. A cura di F. Flora. *Firenze*: Le Monnier, 1942. 139 pp. L. 12.

Apostoliti, P. — Il Novecento nella critica letteraria contemporanea. *Torino*: Paravia, 1941. 135 pp. L. 9.50.

Baretti, Giuseppe. — Lettere familiari a' suoi tre fratelli Filippo Giovanni e Amedeo. Nuova edizione condotta sulla originale con introduzione note e indice a cura di Luigi Piccioni. *Torino*: Società Subalpina Editrice, 1941. xlii + 309 pp. L. 45.

Battelli, G. — Le più belle leggende cristiane tratte da codici e da antiche stampe, commentate e illustrate. 4a ediz. riveduta con l'aggiunta di tre leggende di cui una inedita. *Milano*: Hoepli, 1942. xvi + 634 pp. 34 tavv. L. 45.

Bianco di San Secondo, E. — Baldassare Castiglione nella vita e negli scritti. *Verona*: Edizioni "L'Albero," 1942. 336 pp. L. 20.

Bigi, E.—La poesia del Boiardo. *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1941. 154 pp. L. 20.

Binni, W.—Vita interiore di Alfieri. *Bologna*: Cappelli, 1942. 180 pp. L. 12.

Bizzarri, E.—L'Italiano Francesco Guicciardini. *Firenze*: Vallecchi, 1942. 373 pp. L. 20.

Bonarelli, G.—Filli di Sciro. Discorsi e appendice. A cura di G. Gambarino. *Bari*: Laterza, 1941. 336 pp. L. 40. (Scrittori d'Italia.)

Bonfantini, M.—Le sacre rappresentazioni italiane. Raccolta delle laudi e delle sacre rappresentazioni medioevali scritte in Italia tra il secolo XIII e il XV. *Milano*: Bompiani, 1942. 700 pp. 120 tavv. L. 70.

Bonuzzi, A.—Guida alla lettura dell'Orlando Furioso. *Verona*: La Tipografia Veronese, 1941. 320 pp. L. 30.

Borsi, G.—Dante e Boccaccio. *Vicenza*: Soc. An. Tipografica editrice, 1942. 112 pp. L. 15.

Bottazzi, B.—Ludovico Ariosto e l'Inghilterra. *Reggio Em.*: Nironi e Prandi, 1941. 36 pp. L. 5.

Bruers, A.—Nuovi Saggi Dannunziani. 2a serie. *Bologna*: Zanichelli, 1942. 214 pp. L. 25.

Carotenuto, Silvestro.—Galileo Galilei nella storia e nella leggenda. *Firenze*: Vallecchi, 1941. 440 pp. L. 20.

Castiglione, B.—Il Cortegiano. A cura di M. Luzzi. *Milano*: Garzanti, 1941. 408 pp. L. 20.

Ceriello, G. R.—Saggi di varia letteratura. *Milano*: Ceschina, 1942. 280 pp. L. 20.

Cian, V.—La lingua di Baldassare Castiglione. *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1942. 104 pp. L. 10.

— Umanesimo e Rinascimento. *Firenze*: Le Monnier, 1942. 176 pp. L. 18.

Cione, Edmondo.—Dal De Sanctis al Novecento. Prospettive filosofiche. *Milano*: Garzanti, 1942. 191 pp. L. 20.

Compagni, D.—La Cronica e passi scelti della "Cronaca" di G. Villani. A cura di F. Cusin. *Milano*: Garzanti, 1941. 427 pp. L. 20.

Comparetti, D.—Virgilio nel Medioevo. Vol. II. A cura di G. Pasquali. *Firenze*: La Nuova Italia, 1941. 332 pp.

Conferenze dantesche tenute a cura del Comitato Milanese della Società Dantesca Italiana. Vol. VI: Studi su Dante: Dante nel Risorgimento. G. Mazzoni—A. Galletti—M. Stico—G. F. Gobbi—F. Trucchi—A. Chiari—M. Di Nardo—A. Monti. Pref. di G. Galbati. *Milano*: Hoepli, 1941. xvi + 298 pp. L. 22.

D'Annunzio, Gabriele.—Laudi del cielo, del

mare, della terra e degli eroi. Con interpretazione e commento di E. Palmieri. Libro terzo: Aleyone. *Bologna*: Zanichelli, 1941. xviii + 476 pp. L. 25.

— Le tre redazioni di un taccuino di guerra di Gabriele D'Annunzio. A cura di A. Bruers. *Milano*: Mondadori, 1942. 85 pp. L. 18.

Della Casa, G.—Il galateo. Con uno studio sul suo significato filosofico-pedagogico nell'età del Rinascimento. A cura di G. Tinivella. 2a. ediz. *Milano*: Hoepli, 1941. xxiv + 270 pp. L. 15.

Dentoni, E.—L'opera artistica di Gabriele D'Annunzio. *Firenze*: Marzocco, 1941. 216 pp. L. 15.

Devoto, G.—Introduzione alla grammatica. *Firenze*: La Nuova Italia, 1941. 302 pp. L. 12.

Di Pietro, A.—Saggio su Pirandello. *Milano*: Vita e Pensiero, 1941. xii + 114 pp. L. 12.

Dominici, L.—Il Grande Duca d'Urbino. *Urbino*: Feltria, 1941. 298 pp. 6 tav. L. 16.

Evola, N.—Bibliografia degli studi sulla letteratura italiana (1920-1934). Terza puntata. *Milano*: "Vita e Pensiero," 1941. 304 pp. L. 60.

Falqui, E.—Di noi contemporanei. *Firenze*: Parenti, 1940. 227 pp. L. 25.

Farini, P. e Ascarelli, A.—Dizionario della lingua italiana di caccia. *Milano*: Garzanti, 1941. 412 pp. L. 12.

Fattorello, E.—Il giornalismo italiano. Vol. I. *Udine*: I. D. E. A., 1941. viii + 247 pp. L. 60.

Ferrero, G.—Prosa illustre dell'Ottocento. Vol. II: Leopardi-Carducci. *Torino*: Paravia, 1941. 151 pp. L. 9.

Flora, F.—Storia della letteratura italiana. Vol. II, parte I. *Milano*: Mondadori, 1941. 570 pp. L. 24.

— e Nicastro, L.—Storia della letteratura italiana. Vol. III: L'Ottocento e il Novecento. *Milano*: Mondadori, 1941. 872 pp. L. 28.

Foberti, F.—Gioacchino da Fiore e il Gioacchinismo antico e moderno. *Padova*: C. E. D. A. M., 1942. xii + 274 pp. L. 35.

Folengo, T.—Il Baldus e le altre opere latine volgari. Passi scelti e commentati da U. E. Paoli. *Firenze*: Le Monnier, 1941. xvi + 320 pp. L. 18.

Franceschini, E.—Leggenda minore di Santa Caterina da Siena. *Milano*: "Vita e Pensiero," 1942. xvi + 168 pp. L. 25.

Fucini, R.—Lettere ad un amico. Con pref. di G. Fortunato. *Milano*: Trevisini, 1942. 206 pp. L. 15.

Garin, E.—Filosofi italiani del Quattrocento. Pagine scelte tradotte e illustrate con

8 tavv. *Firenze*: Le Monnier, 1942. vi + 552 pp. L. 65.

— Il Rinascimento italiano. *Milano*: I. S. P. I., 1941. 404 pp. L. 22.

Garone, D.—Giovanni Verga. Con pref. di L. Russo. *Firenze*: Vallecchi, 1941. xxix + 134 pp. L. 10.

Gentile, G.—Il pensiero di Leonardo. *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1941. 33 pp. L. 4.

Giazotto, R.—Il melodramma a Genova nei secoli XVII e XVIII. *Genova*: Ente del Teatro "Carlo Felice," 1941. 79 pp.

Guicciardini, F.—Opere. Vol. I. *Milano*: Rizzoli, 1941. 840 pp. L. 60.

Gustarelli, A.—Giuseppe Mazzini. L'Uomo e la sua attività. Lo Scrittore. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1941. 111 pp. L. 5.

Leonardo da Vinci.—I libri di meccanica, nella ricostruzione ordinata di A. Uccelli, preceduti da un'introd. critica e da un esame delle fonti. Con 2515 disegni ricavati o ridisegnati dagli originali. *Milano*: Hoepli, 1942. clvi + 676 pp. L. 600.

Leopardi, G.—Epistolario. Nuova ediz. ampliata con lettere dei corrispondenti e con note illustrative, a cura di F. Moroncini. Vol. VII: Appendice con lettere e note aggiunte, a cura di F. Ferretti, e Indice analitico generale di A. Duro. *Firenze*: Le Monnier, 1941. vii + 163 pp. L. 20.

L'Opera filosofica, storica e letteraria di Benedetto Croce. Saggi di scrittori italiani e stranieri e bibliografia dal 1920 al 1941. *Bari*: Laterza, 1942. 364 pp. L. 30.

Malagoli, L.—Le Stanze e l'Orfeo e lo spirito del Quattrocento. *Roma*: Tosi, 1941. 143 pp. L. 12.

—Machiavelli e la civiltà del Rinascimento. *Milano*: I. S. P. I., 1941. 219 pp. L. 14.

Mazzoni, G.—Almae luces, malae cruces. Studi danteschi. *Bologna*: Zanichelli, 1941. 403 pp. L. 30.

Mele, G.—Gergo di guerra. Pref. di R. Corso. *Roma*: Soc. Ed. del Libro Italiano, 1941. 89 pp. L. 6.

Menarini, A.—I gerghi bolognesi. *Modena*: Soc. Tip. Modenese, 1942. 164 pp. L. 40.

Nardi, B.—Dante e la cultura medievale. Nuovi saggi di filosofia dantesca. *Bari*: Laterza, 1942. xii + 334 pp. L. 40.

Natali, G.—Dal Guinizelli al D'Annunzio. *Roma*: Tosi, 1942. 389 pp. L. 35.

Niccolò da Casola.—La guerra d'Attila. Poema franco-italiano, pubblicato dall'unico manoscritto della R. Biblioteca Estense di Modena. Introd. testo e note di G. Stendardo. Pref. di G. Bertoni. *Modena*: Società Tipografica Modenese, 1941. 2 vols. xli + 429; 473 pp. L. 210.

Ottokar, N.—Venezia. Cenni di storia e di cultura veneziane. *Firenze*: La Nuova Italia, 1941. 43 pp. L. 9.

Pastonchi, F.—Francesco Petrarca. *Roma*: R. Accademia l'Italia, 1941. 23 pp. L. 5.

Personè, L. M.—Incontri. Poeti e scrittori antichi e moderni. *Firenze*: Le Monnier, 1942. 254 pp. L. 22.

Petrarca, F.—Le Familiari. Vol. IV: Libri XX-XXIV, Indici. Per cura di V. Rossi e U. Bosco. *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1942. viii + 428 pp.

— Il codice vaticano lat. 3196 autografo del Petrarca, riprodotto a facsimile con introd. di M. Porena. *Roma*: R. Accademia d'Italia, 1941. 64 pp. con 40 tavv. L. 30.

Piccolo, F.—L'Umanesimo. *Firenze*: La Nuova Italia, 1942. 112 pp. L. 10.

Pischedda, G.—Saggio su Antonio Beltrami. *Catania*: Intelisano, 1941. 143 pp. L. 10.

Poemetti allegorico-didattici del secolo XIII. A cura di L. Di Benedetto. *Bari*: Laterza, 1941. 376 pp. L. 50. (Scrittori d'Italia.)

Poeti del secolo XVII. A cura di A. Gustarelli. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1942. 104 pp. L. 4.50.

Poeti della grande guerra. A cura di A. Gustarelli. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1942. 96 pp. L. 4.50.

Pontieri, E.—La Dinastia Aragonesa di Napoli e la casa dei Medici di Firenze. (Dal carteggio familiare). *Napoli*: Miccoli, 1942. 130 pp. L. 25.

Prandi, D.—Bibliografia delle opere di Francesco Redi. *Reggio Em.*: Nironi e Prandi, 1941. viii + 38 pp. L. 30.

Praz, M.—Machiavelli in Inghilterra ed altri saggi. *Roma*: Tumminelli, 1942. 357 pp. L. 35.

Puliatti, P. e Bottino, E.—Lineamenti sull'arte di Luigi Pirandello. *Catania*: Intelisano, 1941. 199 pp. L. 25.

Quarti, G. A.—Quattro secoli di vita veneziana, nella storia, nell'arte, e nella poesia. Scritti rari e curiosi dal 1500 al 1900. Pref. di R. Simoni. *Milano*: Gualdoni, 1941. 2 vols. xvi + 540. 50 illustr. L. 150.

Romano, S. F.—Poetica dell'ermetismo. *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1942. 200 pp. L. 15.

Russo, L.—Giovanni Verga. 3a ediz. riveduta con appendice bibliografica aggiornata. *Bari*: Laterza, 1941. 468 pp. L. 35.

Sanesi, I.—Saggi di critica e di storia letteraria. *Bocca*, 1941. 550 pp. L. 80.

Santangelo, S.—La lingua di Giovanni Meli. *Palermo*: Palumbo, 1941. 84 pp. L. 20.

Santini, E.—Le lezioni pavesi di Ugo Foscolo. *Palermo*: Palumbo, 1941. 320 pp. L. 38.

Saponaro, M.—Leopardi. *Milano*: Garzanti, 1941. 408 pp. 12 illustr. e 1 lettera autografa. L. 40.

Savino, E.—Un curioso poligrafo del Quattrocento: Antonio de Ferrariis (Galateo), Accademico Pontaniano. Egesi critica dei suoi scritti. *Bari*: Macri, 1942. xxviii + 536 pp. L. 45.

Scopa, E.—Sul sentimento religioso di Torquato Tasso. *Napoli*: Federico e Ardia, 1941. 20 pp. L. 3.

—La varia coltura di Torquato Tasso nei riflessi delle sue opere. *Napoli*: Federico e Ardia, 1941. 40 pp. L. 5.

Spongano, Raffaele.—Un capitolo di storia della nostra prosa d'arte (La Prosa letteraria del Quattrocento). *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1941. 39 pp. L. 5.

Studi su Giovanni Meli, nel secondo centenario della nascita—1740-1940. *Palermo*: Palumbo, 1942. xvi + 578. Con 38 tavv. L. 150.

Svanascini, M.—Frammenti di marcia sulla Divina Commedia. *Mendrisio*: Edizioni Stucchi, 1941. 57 pp.

Tommaseo, N.—Poesie e prose, scelte e commentate a cura di R. Ciampini. *Torino*: S. E. I., 1942. xxxvi + 277 pp. L. 16.

Tonelli, L.—La tragedia di Gabriele d'Annunzio. A cura di U. Bosco. *Milano*: Corbaccio, 1941. 300 pp. L. 15.

Troccoli, G.—Saggi Danteschi. *Firenze*: Le Monnier, 1941. 240 pp. L. 12.50.

Trucchi, E.—Esposizione della Divina Commedia di Dante Alighieri. *Milano*: Montaldi e C., 1942. 3 voll. 1772 pp. L. 120.

Turri, V. e Renda, U.—Dizionario storico-critico della letteratura italiana (1000-1941). Nuova edizione completamente rifatta. *Torino*: Paravia, 1941. viii + 1143. L. 68.

Vallone, A.—Il romanzo italiano dalla Scapigliatura alla Ronda. *Genova*: Emiliano degli Orfini, 1941. 335 pp. L. 20.

Varese, C.—Vita interiore di Ugo Foscolo. *Bologna*: Cappelli, 1942. 216 pp. L. 12.

Viscardi, A.—Le origini. Ristampa corretta. *Milano*: F. Vallardi, 1942. xxi + 575. L. 75.

Vitale, E.—Guicciardini. *Torino*: U. T. E. T., 1941. 324 pp. L. 26.

Vocabolario della lingua italiana. A cura della R. Accademia d'Italia. Prefazione di L. Federzoni. Vol. I: A-C. *Milano*: Hoepli, 1941. xxiv + 978 pp.

Volpi, G.—Vocabolario della lingua italiana. *Firenze*: Barbera, 1941. viii + 1357 pp. L. 120. (Nuova edizione.)

Zieger, A.—La formazione poetico-politica di Giovanni Prati (1830-1846). *Trento*: R. Deputazione di Storia per le Venezie, 1941. 153 pp. L. 18.

SPANISH

Díaz Mirón, Salvador.—Poesías completas, ed. A. Castro Leal. *México*: Porrúa Hnos., 1941. 331 pp.

Grases, P.—Acerca del grupo *zo* en la conjugación castellana. *Caracas*: Tip. Americana, 1942. 89 pp.

Gutiérrez Eskildsen, R. M.—El habla popular y campesina de Tabasco. *México*: Univ. Nac. Autónoma de México, 1941. 92 pp.

Saubidet, Tito.—Vocabulario y refranero criollo con textos y dibujos originales. *Buenos Aires*: Kraft, 1943. xvi + 423 pp.

Schwab, F.—Bibliografía de libros y folletos peruanos, 1940-41. *Lima*: Impresiones y Publicidad, 1942. 109 pp.

Vargas, J. M.—La cultura de Quito colonial. *Quito*: Santo Domingo, 1941. 280 pp.

Vega Vega, F. de la.—Ismael Enrique Arciniegas. *Medellín*: Revista Universidad Católica Bolivariana, 1941. 24 pp.

Whitaker, Hussey, and Others.—Latin America and the Enlightenment. *New York*: Appleton Century, 1942. 130 pp.

Willbern, G. DeW.—Vocabulary Elements in Thirteenth-Century Castilian. Part of U. of Chicago diss., 1944. 27 pp. lithotyped.

GENERAL

Abraham, R. D. and Sannosuke Yamamoto.—Japanese for Military and Civilian Use. *Philadelphia*: David McKay, 1944. 159 pp.

Churchill, Bernstein, Gervasi, Pribichevich, Adamic.—Marshal Tito and His Gallant Bands. *New York*: United Committee of South Slavic Americans, 1944. 32 pp.

Fosdick, R. B.—The Rockefeller Foundation. A Review for 1943. *New York*: 1944. 63 pp.

Kaulfers, W. V.—Modern Languages for Modern Schools. *New York*: McGraw-Hill, 1942. xviii + 525 pp. \$3.50.

Kramer, S. N.—Sumerian Mythology. A Study of Spiritual and Literary Achievement in the Third Millennium B. C. *Philadelphia*: American Philosophical Soc., 1944. xiv + 125 pp.

Rabin, Chaim.—Everyday Hebrew. *Philadelphia*: David McKay, 1944. 127 pp. \$2.00.

Re-Creation of Yugoslavia. *New York*: United Committee of South-Slavic Americans, 1944. 23 pp.

Shipley, J. T.—Dictionary of World Literature. *New York*: The Philosophical Library, 1943. xv + 633 pp.

Tetens, T. H.—Know Your Enemy. Preface by Emil Ludwig. Introd. by Rudolph Fluegge. *New York*: Soc. for Prevention of World War III, 1944. 126 pp.

etas,
nos.,

a la
neri-

abla
ico;

pp.

nero

ales.

pp.

s y

pre-

nial.

que
dad

atin
rk:

ents
U.

ma-
ian
44.

ich,
ant
of

da-
44.

for
ill,

A
ent
ia:
+

la-
00.
k:
ns,

ra-
ry,

ace
ge.
rld

THE MIND OF A POET

A STUDY OF WORDSWORTH'S THOUGHT
WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO

THE PRELUDE

By RAYMOND D. HAVENS

Fifteen years have gone into this search for the hiding places of a poet's power. There are chapters on the part matter-of-factness, passion, fear, wonder, solitude, silence, and loneliness, animism, nature, anti-rationalism, the mystic experience, religion, and imagination played in the thought and poetry of Wordsworth. Other topics are considered more briefly and *The Prelude*, the most illuminating account in English of the mind of a poet, is examined in detail. Theory has not been imposed on poetry but Wordsworth's beliefs have been deduced and explained from what he himself wrote and said.

xviii + 670 pages, two maps, buckram. \$5.00

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS BALTIMORE 18

THE CRITICAL WORKS OF JOHN DENNIS

EDITED BY

EDWARD NILES HOOKER

VOLUME II 1711-1729

This volume completes the publication of the entire body of Dennis's literary criticism. For many years scorned and neglected, Dennis has come into his own as the first professional literary critic in England, as the first great protagonist of John Milton, and as the champion of Molière, Corneille, Racine, Shakespeare, Dryden, Etherege, Wycherley, and Congreve. General appreciation of the value of Dennis's work has hitherto been impossible because most of it is rare, costly, and difficult to come at. Only five of his numerous critical writings have been reprinted in our country. Besides the text of the essays, this edition contains a long introduction on the significance of Dennis's contributions to literary theory and criticism, over two hundred pages of Explanatory Notes which outline all of the main movements in Augustan criticism, and a full, workable Index.

Volume I. Pp. xi + 537. Price, \$5.00—Volume II. Pp. cxliv + 588. Price, \$7.50

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS BALTIMORE 18

KANY AND KAUN'S

ELEMENTARY RUSSIAN CONVERSATION

NOW READY

- Russian conversation is now made easy, practical, and interesting. This first elementary manual enables students to practice simple Russian speech patterns applying to everyday matters within a few days after taking up grammar study.

It contains lively, natural dialogues that make memorization of words and correct phrases and sentences remarkably easy, together with an outline of Russian grammar. 88 pages. \$.40

To be followed by an intermediate and an advanced manual

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO ATLANTA SAN FRANCISCO DALLAS LONDON

Just
published!

Mansilla

UNA EXCURSIÓN A LOS INDIOS ÂRANQUELES

Edited by OTIS H. GREEN

University of Pennsylvania

This classic of the Argentine holds a place in Latin American literature comparable to that of Parkman's *Oregon Trail* in the literature of the United States. Reliable critics have placed *Excursión* beside Sarmiento's *Facundo* and Hernández's *Martin Fierro*, as one of the three most representative works in the national literature.

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY

257 Fourth Avenue

New York 10, New York